DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 254 FL 018 506

AUTHOR Wilkins, George W., Jr., Ed.
TITLE Dimension: Languages 71. A World without Walls. Proceedings of the Southern Conference on Language Teaching (7th, Atlanta, GA, October 1971).
INSTITUTION Southern Conference on Language Teaching, Spartanburg, SC.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 94p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Black Dialects; Classroom Techniques; Conference Proceedings; Educational Television; Elementary Secondary Education; *FLES; *Individualized Instruction; Linguistic Theory; *Literature Appreciation; Metaphors; *Nonstandard Dialects; Second Language Instruction

ABSTRACT

Presentations on aspects of foreign language instruction include: "A World Without Walls" (Lorraine A. Strasheim); "Practical Aspects of Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction" (Howard B. Altman); "Teaching Foreign Language Through Literature" (Jeanne Varney Pleasants); "Individualization of Foreign Language Instruction" (Howard B. Altman); "Foreign Languages in the Elementary School and Bi-lingual Education" (Theodore Andersson); "The Georgia FLES-TV Program" (Yvonne de Wright); "Metaphor, Black Discourse Style, and Cultural Reality" (Grace Sims Holt); "The Third Dimension of Bi-lingual Education" (Robert Rebert); "Who's to Say: Controversies over What Linguists Can and Can Not Say About Nonstandard Dialects" (Walt Wolfram); and "Summary of the Conference: Practical Applications" (Lorraine A. Strasheim). (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DIMENSION: LANGUAGES '71

ED318254

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Gratman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Proceedings of the Seventh Southern Conference on Language Teaching Atlanta, Georgia

GEORGE W. WILKINS, JR., Editor

FL018504

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DIMENSION: LANGUAGES '71

A WORLD WITHOUT WALLS

Proceedings of the Seventh Southern
Conference on Language Teaching
Atlanta, Georgia

GEORGE W. WILKINS, JR., Editor

3

Copyright © 1971 by the Southern Conference on Language Teaching, Converse College, Spartanburg, S. C. 29301

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, adapted or translated without permission in writing from the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 72-83422

Printed in the United States of America

Standard Book Number 0-87352-157-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A World Without Walls 5
Lorraine A. Strasheim

Practical Aspects of Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction 13
Howard B. Altman

Teaching Foreign Language Through Literature 27
Jeanne Varney Pleasants

WORKSESSIONS

Individualization of Foreign Language Instruction 45
Howard B. Altman

Foreign Languages in the Elementary School and Bi-lingual Education 49
Theodore Andersson

The Georgia FLES-TV Program 53
Yvonne de Wright

Metaphor, Black Discourse Style, and Cultural Reality 57
Grace Sims Holt

The Third Dimension of Bi-lingual Education 67
Robert Rebert

Who's to Say: Controversies over What Linguists Can and Cannot Say About Nonstandard Dialects 75
Walt Wolfram

Summary of the Conference: Practical Applications 89
Lorraine A. Strasheim

A World Without Walls

Lorraine A. Strasheim
Indiana Language Program

For all the generations of men prior to World War II, physical and figurative walls were erected for shelter, for protection, and for privacy as a matter of course, as a natural, rational development in the life of a man or in the life of a society. Until a generation or so ago, every man could identify positively with Virgil's: "How happy those whose walls already rise!" But, "within the memory of man," as the ancient Roman was wont to say, our attitudes toward walls have changed; today we are much more of Robert Frost's persuasion that "Something there is that doesn't love a wall." "Within the memory of man" the Berlin Wall—the *ultimate wall*—was built. And now, like the Frost of an earlier day, we are inclined to say:

> Before I built a wall I'd ask to know
> What I was walling in and walling out,
> And to whom I was like to give offense.[1]

The Berlin Wall made the word "wall" an obscenity. It is entirely possible that the concept of "a world without walls" was born in that moment in which the Berlin Wall burst upon our collective consciousness as a physical and figurative reality.

The "world" of the people in this room is the world of foreign-language education. Whom have the walls of our world walled in? Walled out? To whom have the walls of our world been "like to give offence"? Are the walls of our world secure and well established, or have they already been breached? Are some of these walls already crumbling? Are there some we should destroy ourselves in righteous indignation? Are there any "Berlin Walls" in *our* world? What is the state of our world's walls?

In his 1968 address as Executive Secretary of ACTFL, F. André Paquette held out a "measure of hope" for our profession, concluding with:

> One of the men assassinated in the U.S. in 1968 used to say, "I have a dream. . . ." The other paraphrased George Bernard Shaw and said, "Some men see things as they are and ask, 'Why?' I dream things that have never been and

[1] This speech was the keynote address, Oct. 21, 1971.

> ask, 'Why not?' Perhaps it is time for us foreign language teachers, us humanists, to dream the impossible dream. . . ."[2]

"I have a dream. . . ." "Some men see things as they are and ask, 'Why?' I dream things that have never been and ask, 'Why not?' Is a world without walls just a dream, just a 'catchy' theme for a conference?

L. P. Hartley is quoted in a new movie, *The Go-Between:* "The past is a foreign country: they do things differently there." That description of the past, a time concerned with wall building, is essentially the same one Margaret Mead gives us in her discussions of postfigurative, cofigurative, and prefigurative cultures. She writes, in *Culture and Commitment, A Study of the Generation Gap:*

> The distinctions I am making among three different kinds of culture—postfigurative, in which children learn primarily from their forebears, cofigurative, in which both children and adults learn from their peers, and prefigurative, in which adults also learn from their children—are a reflection of the period in which we live. Primitive societies and small religious and ideological enclaves are primarily postfigurative, deriving authority from the past. Great civilizations, which necessarily have developed techniques for incorporating change, characteristically make use of some form of cofigurative learning from peers, from playmates, fellow students, and fellow apprentices. We are now entering a period, new in history, in which the young are taking on new authority in their prefigurative apprehension of the still unknown future.[3]

What Toffler calls the "future tense" of education, Mead says will require a new kind of teacher.

> We must create new models for adults who can teach their children not what to learn but how to learn and not what they should be committed to but the value of commitment.[4]

For the great mass of us, a foreign-language world without walls is going to have to be a learned activity.

And so the first wall to come down has to be our block against further learning: we shall have to cease rearranging endlessly that which we have already learned and devote time to becoming co-learners. There is no room in the world which is becoming for "terminal" degrees. We tell our students things like:

> *So, today's college man must, first, recognize that his education is perishable and will require continuing study, formal or informal. Second, he must think out what he must do in*

> *each intervening year after graduation to assure that he will remain an educated person 20 years from graduation—in 1991.*[5]

If the student's education is perishable today, what can we say of his teacher's? Don't the teachers of today have to begin demonstrating their abilities to learn new things, to relearn some old ones, and to unlearn some inappropriate ones? A prefigurative motto of sorts was voiced by Prime Minister Sato: "I think of today not as the day after yesterday, but as the day before tomorrow."[6] *Today IS the day before tomorrow; yesterday is a part of the past where "they do things differently."*

Our prefigurative young have already taught us several lessons: the dissatisfaction which swelled against this country's undeclared war in Vietnam came from youthful "teachers"; the concern about the environment and pollution also started with them. And so the wall against further learning has been breached; we are not discussing tearing down a solid wall but rather letting one crumble.

But as this wall crumbles, we shall have to accept the fact that our unidirectional instructional program will also end. The halcyon days of our professional "pecking order" are nearly over. There *are* lessons a college professor can learn from a secondary—or an elementary-school teacher. And most of these "lessons" have to do with some new kinds of students who are presenting themselves for college educations in the seventies. As a fine young guidance counselor told me in Nashville, Tennessee last year: "In the old days everyone took college preparatory courses in the hope that he would be enabled to go to college. Today nobody takes college prep but everybody goes."

Suburbia alone cannot guide our country and solve its dilemmas, however fearfully we approach the teaching of minority groups of every description. *Another wall which is disintegrating is that one determining what an education is and for whom it is intended.* As high-school editor Bernice Sakuma wrote under the caption TRADITION BOMBS, noting that only 73 couples had attended the Junior-Senior Prom:

> Have you ever wondered whatever happened to the Carnival, Senior Mother-Daughter Tea . . . the Faculty Honors Banquet, the student body officers nominating convention, and the annual dramatic presentations? . . . Student disinterest in organized school activities might be labeled with the general, overused "apathy." But such a categorization is unwarranted. . . . Even though Cubberly (High School) has seen the phasing out of certain traditional events, perhaps this simply reflects constructive student interest in other activities . . . a trend away from social events toward increasing

student awareness of their lives in relation to the world they will be graduating into?[7]

The student of the seventies, be he black or white or brown, be he from suburbia or inner-city or rural areas, be he male or female, is fighting valiantly to persuade the professional educator that education belongs to HIM, not any teacher, and that the school or college is responsible for a very small part of the total education he receives. To the student of the seventies the unexamined curriculum is a wall which is "like to give offence" to everyone.

The student's absorption with the world he lives in and "will be graduating into" is clearly illustrated in this example from Charles M. Schultz's *Peanuts;* Lucy is the teacher and Linus the student It is a prefigurative lesson of the highest order.

Lucy: "When she saw the little house in the woods, she wondered who lived there so she knocked at the door. No one answered so she knocked again." What do you think will happen?

Linus: I can't imagine.

Lucy: ". . . Still no one answered, so Goldilocks opened the door and walked in. There before her, in the little room, she saw a table set for three. . . . There was a great big bowl of porridge, a middle-sized bowl of porridge, and a little, wee bowl of porridge. She tested the great big bowl of porridge. . . . 'Oh, this is too hot,' she said. Then she tasted the middle-sized bowl of porridge. 'Oh, this is too cold.' Then she tasted the little, wee bowl. 'Oh, this is just right,' she said, and she ate it all up."

Linus: I have a question!

Lucy: About what?

Linus: Well, it's in regard to cooling. . . . It would seem to me that if the middle-sized bowl was cold, the little, wee bowl would be cold, too, rather than 'just right,' and . . .

P O W !

I never even brought up the far more obvious point of illegal entry![8]

The wall between the school and the outside world is under siege. When students bring the outside world into our classrooms, we sometimes demonstrate reluctance to acknowledge that world, we sometimes show hostility toward this intrusion of that world into our own more comfortable one; most often we have revealed ourselves unable to cope with the "real" world of the student. In the past we walled

out the students who had a world different from that of the teacher; contemporary social pressures and financial constraints, however, have compelled the foreign-language world to encompass not only the cultures of the target countries but the cultures of the target students. HOW MUCH EASIER IT HAS BEEN TO LOOK AT THE BRIDGES OF SPAIN OR GERMANY THAN TO BUILD BRIDGES TO STUDENTS WHOSE VALUES DIFFER SO RADICALLY FROM OUR OWN!

Sidney P. Marland, the nineteenth U.S. Commissioner of Education, has said:

> We must invent new ways of accounting for our effectiveness. And if we cannot account for our effectiveness we should get out of the way. This applies particularly to school leaders at all levels. We are engaged in a totally new perception of education in our cities. Whereas a few years ago the schools were charged with providing equal educational opportunity, they are now charged with providing equal education. This is quite different. The ball was in the other court when, given the opportunity, the student succeeded or failed, and good riddance to the dropout. The sudden new demand for equal education as distinct from equal opportunity has quietly sprung, full blown, as a new, raw, and untested philosophy. The child no longer fails if his equal opportunity goes unfulfilled. The school, we are told, has failed, the teacher has failed, the superintendent has failed, the board of education has failed. This new overriding expectation cannot be turned back. Nor do I believe we as a profession would want it turned back.[9]

Equal education is "wall-less" education. The question we as professional educators have to answer is if we are equal to the demands of equal education. And do not for one moment brand this demand for equal education a racial issue. There are more students who have been failed by their teachers, their superintendents and boards of education—of my race—than any of the minorities.

Is equal education the same kind of dream as a world without walls? Are both of these ideas merely stimuli to the question, "Why?" It appears not. There are some dreamers in our foreign-language world who have dared to "dream things that have never been," who have dared to ask, "Why not?" Rudolph Masciantonio and Eleanor Sandstrom in Philadelphia are such dreamers. They have prepared a Latin FLES offering which uses the target language as a *vehicle* to improve the verbal skills of linguistically disadvantaged children. The creators of *Romani Viventes et Dicentes* are dreamers, but they are also trying to validate their dream with hard data.

Shirley Krogmeier of Marshall-University High School in Minneapolis is another dreamer who asked, "Why not?" Miss Krogmeier used German as a *means* of working upon the changing of social behavior. Many of the students have now made German an *end* in their educations, just as many students in Philadelphia have now made Latin an *end* in theirs, but these are concomitants—not objectives. Neither the Minneapolis nor the Philadelphia offering would have been possible if the authors of the plans had not been willing to go beyond the walls—the limits—of the standard sequence or the college requirement. Professor Carl Ziegler of my own institution has also broken through the walls of our foreign-language world to teach German to "Discovery 71" students. Not only are these people unlikely foreign-language students, they are students of a kind rarely found on the college campus.

The "impossible dream" is probably Parkway School in Philadelphia. Parkway School is a deliberately designed "school without walls." In his article about Parkway, Henry Resnik says that "American society may not be ready for the kind of people that Parkway students are preparing to become" in exotic courses like Zen Watercolors, Candlemaking, and Leatherwork, conventional offerings like General Science, Basic English, and Typing, or the eleven languages which are taught. Reznik says:

> A student's typical day might include a course in journalism at the Philadelphia *Bulletin* taught by the newspaper's staff, a lecture in physical science at the Franklin Institute, lunch in a nearby coffee shop, "tutorial" in the art museum (these groups of eighteen or so, which meet four times a week, are the base, something like a family, in which students receive counseling, instruction in basic skills, and evaluation), and a couple of hours' work in a downtown auto shop or a furniture-maker's studio in the little Bohemia of Sansom Street. Parkway students can conceivably spend the morning in an office building a few blocks from the Delaware River, Philadelphia's eastern boundary, and the afternoon at the University of Pennsylvania, forty blocks westward. Obviously, the Parkway Program involves a good deal of walking, but students who need to travel more than ten blocks receive free tokens for buses and subways.[10]

The "outside world" is the "inside world" in the Parkway Program. And the Parkway concept is very difficult to accept, especially among those teachers who still issue hall passes to the restroom. But the Parkway approach is one way of preparing the student for the world into which he will be graduating. *If we will not let the world in, we are going to have to let the student out.*

The walls of our foreign-language world are coming down—the

walls of "elitist" student selection, the walls of the college requirement, the walls of the so-called "standard sequence." Whether it will be the student demands for relevance or the administrator demands for financial responsibility which bring them down, no matter. We have a choice of dismantling the walls which survive or of standing with our backs to them as others tear them down. *And in a foreign-language world with few or no walls, we had better become TEACHERS first, FOREIGN-LANGUAGE TEACHERS second, and GERMAN, FRENCH, SPANISH, ITALIAN, RUSSIAN, OR LATIN TEACHERS third. In an era destroying the compartmentalization of education and demanding interdisciplinary approaches, we are faced with the need to learn to talk with each other while we are learning to talk with our colleagues in other subject-matter areas. The first wall we CAN and MUST pull down—on occasions like this one—is the Babel we have developed through our monolingual professional language groups.*

No one is seriously proposing that you work for a Parkway—an actual "school without walls"—but you can work for a school with multiple openings in the walls. You can exchange classes with other foreign-language colleagues to "share the wealth," work on mini-units with other subject-matter specialists, and you can become interested in that part of the student body—the majority—so avidly that you cultivate them and design your course offerings—Stage One courses as described by Wilga Rivers which are not "*Pre*-anything"; interdisciplinary approaches like those in Commack, New York and Gary, Indiana; foreign-language exploratory offerings like FLEX in Topeka, Kansas or the total exploration offered in Apollo Junior High School in Antioch, Tennessee; or even standard sequences which stress the articulation of first and second year above all else—to "recruit" these students into our world.

In order to survive in the "real" world without walls, we shall *have* to dream. It will not be enough to say, "I have a dream . . .", however, nor will it suffice to say, "Some men see things as they are and ask, 'Why?' I dream things that have never been and ask, 'Why not?'" We shall have to become T.E. Lawrence's "dreamers of the day" who are "dangerous men, for they may act their dream with open eyes, to make the dream possible." How do you make a dream possible? John Holt, in *What Do I Do Monday?* says: "The way to begin is—to begin."[11]

Whatever YOUR dream, and I hope that it is a world without walls for your sake and for the sake of all the upcoming prefigurative young, the way to make a dream possible is to begin, to act your dream with open eyes to make the dream possible TODAY which IS the day before the future. Let it not be said of us, as Christopher Morley put it:

There was so much handwriting on the wall
That even the wall fell down.

FOOTNOTES

The quotations in the presentation without citations were taken from *Bartlett's.*

[1] Robert Frost. "Mending Wall." NORTH OF BOSTON. *The Poems of Robert Frost.* (New York: The Modern Library, 1946), page 36.

[2] F. André Paquette. "A Measure of Hope." *Foreign Language Annals*, Volume Two, Number Four (May 1969), page 435.

[3] Margaret Mead. *Culture and Commitment, A Study of the Generation Gap.* (Garden City, New York: Natural History Press/Doubleday & Company, Incorporated, 1970), page 1.

[4] Ibid., page 92.

[5] Terrell H. Bell. "Year 1991." *American Education*, Volume 7, Number 1 (January-February 1971), page 25.

[6] Prime Minister Sato. Quoted by Lady Bird Johnson. *A White House Diary.* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), page 218.

[7] Bernice Sakuma. Quoted by Sylvia Berry Williams. *Hassling.* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970), page 269.

[8] Charles M. Schultz. *Peanuts Treasury.* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), unnumbered pages.

[9] "Quoting Marland." Convictions and observations about education excerpted from the speeches and writings of Sidney P. Marland, the 19th Commissioner of Education. *American Education*, Volume 7, Number 1 (January-February 1971), page 4.

[10] Henry Resnik. "Parkway: A School Without Walls." In *High School*, edited by Ronald Gross and Paul Osterman. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971), page 250.

[11] John Holt. *What Do I Do Monday?* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Incorporated, 1970), page 303.

Some Practical Aspects of Individualized Foreign Language Instruction

Howard B. Altman
University of Washington

I.

INTRODUCTION

It is doubtful whether any educational phenomenon has so stirred up the emotions of foreign language teachers in such a short span of time as the individualization of instruction. Only a few years ago, individualized FL instruction was for all practical purposes unheard of, an idea whose time had not yet come. For example, in the first volume of the *Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education*, published in 1969, "individualized instruction" is not even entered as a topic in the index, although the phrase does appear in connection with programmed instruction with which individualization has been traditionally linked. A year later, however, "individualized instruction" is the main theme of volume II, with specific chapters offering a rationale for the individualization and personalization of instruction and a description of curricula for the individualized foreign language classroom. A chapter entitled "What is Being Done?" in individualized foreign language instruction is featured in the forthcoming third volume of the *Britannica Review*. At the Fifth Southern Conference on Language Teaching which I was privileged to attend in Atlanta in 1969, no mention was made of something called "individualized instruction." Yet a year later, at the Sixth SCOLT in Jacksonville, André Paquette entitled his address "The Decade of the Student Requirement," and Lorraine Strasheim exhorted the profession to make foreign language study relevant for today's youth by offering a multiplicity of language experiences, by individualizing instruction.

Rare, if not non-existent, is the foreign language conference today at which individualized instruction is not one of the central themes, and frequently the only one. Colleges like San Jose State College and San Francisco State College in California and West Chester State College in Pennsylvania have begun to offer formal coursework in the various aspects of individualized foreign language instruction. Many other institutions will doubtless follow suit. Last May, under

a contract with the Office of Education, Stanford University hosted a national Conference on Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction at which some 42 selected practitioners of individualized programs, distinguished foreign language theorists, school administrators, psycholinguists, and critics attempted to write guidelines for the individualization of the foreign language classroom. The *Proceedings of the Stanford Conference* have recently been published[1] and are also available through ERIC. During the past summer, at least one state, Minnesota, sponsored a foreign language curriculum workshop at which teachers were taught how to produce curricula for individualized classrooms. From all of the above it becomes obvious that the pace is accelerating, and as Alvin Toffler has warned,[2] teachers who are unable to cope with change are finding themselves increasingly more bewildered.

The French have a charming expression: *plus ça change, plus c'est la meme chose*. Whatever the reasons for the sudden awakening of interest in individualized instruction—the reader is referred to Lorraine Strasheim's excellent chapter in *Britannica Review* II for information on this point—this is not the first time in the history of American education that both educators and the general public have become concerned about individual differences in learning abilities. Such statements as the following make this quite clear:

> It has become palpably absurd to expect to achieve uniform results for uniform assignments made to a class of widely differing individuals. Throughout the educational world there has therefore awakened a desire to find some way of adapting schools to the differing individuals who attend them.[3]

Carlton W. Washburne's "Introduction" to the NSSE Yearbook, *Adapting Schools to Individual Differences*, sounds remarkably like a passage which might be taken from Charles Silberman's *Crisis in the Classroom*, published in 1970.[4] Washburne, however, was writing in the year 1925. It is probably belaboring the obvious to state that capable and dedicated foreign language teachers have *always* sought to adapt their teaching to the abilities, needs, and interests of their students. What is perhaps new today, and what will hopefully prevent the current movement from becoming yet another passing fad, is the development of a systematic and logical framework for individualizing instruction with large numbers of students. As is suggested in the Introduction to the *Proceedings of the Stanford Conference*, the phenomenon of individualized foreign language instruction can retain respectabliity only if it is grounded in sound pedagogical theory and only if there are "rules" by which successful programs operate.[5]

II.

CHARACTERISTICS OF AN INDIVIDUALIZED PROGRAM

Any attempt to define "individualized foreign language instruction" in a way which would prove valid for foreign language classrooms at all levels and in all locations is probably futile. The shape and dimensions of individualized instruction vary according to the needs and resources of each program. Some individualized foreign language programs appear physically no different from non-individualized ones. They make use of ordinary classroom furniture arranged in usual patterns, they operate under a traditionally inflexible schedule, students work with regular textbooks and are evaluated by means of a conventional grading system, etc. Other programs seem physically so loosely structured as to make a visitor wonder whether he is really observing a foreign language class in an American educational institution. Budgetary constraints aside, the physical manifestations of individualized foreign language instruction are limited only by the imagination of teachers and students.

There are, however, some common characteristics of many individualized programs, especially as concerns the instruction of first- and second-year students, which seem to have acquired general acceptability:

1. Students are free to work through their curriculum materials at their own pace.

2. Students take tests only when they are prepared for them, and only on materials on which they expect to be tested.

3. When a student needs help to progress in his learning, he works individually with his teacher, or with some other "resource person" in the classroom, in a tutorial manner. Such assistance is given, in theory, only when the student requires and/or requests it, for it is only then that he can best benefit from it.

4. Students always know the nature of their learning task. They know what they are expected to do, under what conditions they must demonstrate what they have learned, and what degree of accuracy is required in this demonstration. They also know that until they have completed their learning objectives, as Florence Steiner has called the steps which lead to fulfillment of the major objectives of the foreign language course,[6] they may not proceed to another unit of work.

Professor Robert L. Politzer of Stanford University was probably the first to suggest that individualizing learning may entail three different processes.[7] In the characteristics of individualized foreign language programs offered above, the outstanding feature is that of

self-pacing. Individualized learning means the student works at his own pace. There has been a tendency among some to suggest that self-pacing is, in itself, a rather narrow conception of the process of individualization, and there is merit to this position However, if one recalls John B. Carroll's model of school learning,[5] which has become the basis of Bloom's work in mastery learning,[7] one realizes the significance of the role of time in the whole learning process Other things being equal (which, of course, they rarely are), if students are allowed to take as long as they *need* to perform their learning tasks, there is every reason to expect that practically all students can achieve mastery level of the material.

One can then speak, first of all, of individualizing the *rate* or *speed* at which a learner works through his curriculum. Secondly, assuming the components of the curriculum remain predetermined for all students, one can individualize the *method* (i.e., the learning strategies) by which students attack a given learning task. Expressed another way, if the goals of instruction remain the same for all students, the means of attaining those goals may still vary. This is a second aspect of individualization. Some students learn better deductively, others inductively; some learn through auditory memory, others through visual memory; some prefer analogy, others analysis. To assume otherwise is to deny the fact of individual differences in both learning abilities and learning preferences.

Finally, the curriculum itself—i.e., the goals of instruction—can be individualized. It may be helpful to conceive of the total foreign language curriculum in the shape of a tree: there is a rather uniform trunk, representing prerequisite learnings, which all students in the program are expected to ascend—though not necessarily in the same way, or at the same pace, or even to the same height. Then come the various branches of the tree which stretch forth in different directions and at different angles and which depart the "mainstream" of the tree at different points. These branches represent diverse student interests in language-learning, those personal goals which the learner brings with him to the task of foreign-language study. One important question facing language teachers is to determine what constitutes the trunk of our tree-curriculum. If the required time for prerequisite learnings is too long, students may lose interest in, and drop out of, a process which does not seem to be catering to their needs and interests. On the other hand, if the trunk is too short, students may find themselves incapable of working semi-independently upon projects of their choosing, and may require a great deal of assistance from their teacher to function at all.

The fact that physically there is no such thing as an individualized "look" to foreign language instruction has been mentioned above. Unconventional classroom furniture (e.g., small round or rectangular tables around which students can sit and work independently or in small groups), overstuffed chairs, sofas in the corners of the class-

room, etc.), proximity of expensive electro-mechanical equipment, availability of resource centers or "quiet zones" in a library, etc., are *in no way* prerequisites for individualizing instruction. One other characteristic which should be mentioned here is the noise factor. Individualized classrooms are frequently "noisy." With students working alone or in groups of various sizes at different points in their curriculum, it is absurd to assume that the classroom can, or should, remain an anesthetized quiet zone. Most students seem capable of pursuing their activities oblivious to surrounding distractions. A chaotic-looking or a noisy classroom may disturb the teacher, but today's teenagers, who have grown up studying in front of a television set or stereo, are rarely bothered by "background noise" when they *want* to study.

III.

THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER

The single most important component in a successful individualized foreign language program is the classroom teacher and the nature of the teacher's role.

Traditionally, the classroom teacher has functioned, as Florence Steiner suggests, as an "educational broadcaster."[10] The flow of information had its source in the teacher's mouth or pen and its goal in each student's ear or eye. How many times have we, as teachers, laid claim to supreme authority in matters of foreign language instruction! "Never mind what the textbook says, pay attention to what *I* say!" Teachers made all the decisions concerning what, when, why, and how students were to study, and when and under what conditions they had to demonstrate what they had or hadn't learned. If a student did poorly on one of our tests, the explanation was simple: he either didn't pay attention in class (when we had given a definitive explanation of the material to be covered on the test), or he hadn't done the homework we assigned to him, or he was just stupid. Thus, he *deserved* to get a low grade.

Such logic was possible in the days of captive audiences in our classrooms and foreign language requirements in our colleges. The successful "ham actor" could not only teach effectively (albeit to the middle of the class), but could even make many students enjoy learning a foreign language. The expert drillmaster could balance harmony and counterpoint with the skill of an orchestra conductor: "one to one, boy to girl, this row to that, front to back, question to answer, present to past, noun to pronoun, etc., endlessly, class after class, period after period, day after day, test after test, failure after failure, sore throat after sore throat, without the least bit of [visible] exhaustion or boredom and without a great deal of critical evaluation."[11]

The role of the classroom teacher in an individualized foreign language program is considerably more complex, and probably even more significant, than in a non-individualized program. In a recent survey of some 1200 high school students of individualized French, German, and Spanish in Northern California,[12] the aspect of their individualized programs about which students were most outspoken in their criticism was the role of their teachers. Note that the following painful examples in no way condemn individualization as a process and as a philosophy of education, but rather express disappointment in, or antipathy to, the way in which individualization of instruction is being *abused in practice* in some programs:

> Every day the teacher gives us a lecture. We don't get an adequate amount of time to work on our packets, so our grade goes down. The teacher is a hypocrite. The teacher helps only the ones who are so far ahead they don't need help. She should be helping the ones who are far behind. She's boring, no variety, every day the same thing. I think individualized study could be a lot better if we had a halfway decent teacher.
>
> My teacher is a bore, helps no one, lectures, is mean, and isn't fit to be called a teacher. Even though I got an "A" in Spanish, I hate this class and especially the teacher.
>
> I feel that the teacher I have is in no way helping my learning. For when I come with a problem, instead of helping me she just embarrasses me, and I feel that's wrong.

In essence, the task of the foreign language teacher in an individualized program is to *manage and facilitate the learning process.* Note that the emphasis in the teacher's role is no longer on teaching, but rather on managing and facilitating what students learn. This implies a recognition of that fact that what teachers teach, and what students learn, frequently seem to be light years apart. John B. Carroll, I am sure, had a traditional classroom in mind, and maybe even a different type of student, when he suggested in 1966 that students learn, if anything, precisely what they are taught.[13] I would like to amend that formula on the basis of much observation of students in individualized programs: *Students learn, if anything, precisely what they need to and want to learn.*

What then does the foreign language teacher actually do in the classroom? He serves as a "resource person" or resident expert to whom students can come for help, for advice, or for a sympathetic ear. He prepares curricular materials for students who wish to work semi-independently. He sets up and coordinates conversation groups or other group activities to insure the fact that students receive sufficient practice in the spoken language. He prepares learning steps for the basic materials—in the "trunk" phase of our "tree-curriculum"—or adapts the basic materials as needed so that students can

progress on their own without making constant demands upon his time. He leaves to the "machines" the work that machines can do best—endless drilling—but he prepares meaningful and effective "software" for individual student use. This may imply, for example, taking the publisher's tapes and cutting them up into 10-15 minute segments, throwing out the less constructive or most boring portions, and possibly supplementing what is left with activities which are more pertinent to student interests in language learning. He makes sure that the machines are accessible to students whenever they wish to use them, and that all students have been instructed how to operate any of the equipment they need to use. He works with individuals, with small groups, with larger groups, or with the whole class, as needed. He tests students, both formally and informally, whenever they have prepared a given unit of work. He constructs practice tests for students to take and score on their own, so that they may constantly receive feedback on their progress. He delegates many of the teaching tasks to advanced students, who serve as teacher aides, or to paraprofessionals. Such people can perform many of the same teaching-testing activities as the classroom teacher, and thereby free the teacher to work with those students who need his help and expertise. He also functions as a record-keeper, and in this role he is responsible for maintaining information about the progress of each student in the program. Some teachers accomplish this by installing a filing system with separate folders for each student. In summary, the foreign language teacher in an individualized classroom is not unlike the activities director at a resort. His job entails seeing to it that students know what options are open to them and what they are expected to do in each option, and he provides whatever help is needed to let students work as smoothly as possible on their tasks at hand.

IV.

THE NATURE OF MATERIALS

As the emphasis on foreign language education changes from teacher-centered to learner-centered instruction, there ceases to be anything sacrosanct about materials for learning. In essence, anything which contributes to the achievement of students' goals in language learning may be considered proper materials for the classroom. The nature of materials in an individualized foreign language program is limited only by matters of imagination and budget. Even the latter constraint may be circumvented by judicious use of creative thinking coupled with a bit of elbow grease. For example, the German Department at Morgan Hill, California's Live Oak High School has built a model of a German grocery store in one corner of the classroom. Packaging labels for the various "products" were obtained *free of charge* by writing to the German manufacturers. The containers of various sizes on which the labels have been pasted were supplied *free of charge* by the parents of pupils in the program. The net result is a large, beautifully "stocked" grocery store which forms the

setting for a variety of conversational activities. The cost of the materials: practically nothing.[14]

In an individualized foreign language program, in which students have assumed responsibility for their own learning, the role of materials becomes extremely important. Students can not be held accountable for their own learning unless they have been provided with suitable curricular materials. As a general rule, materials for student use in successful individualized foreign language programs are characterized by three main qualities: clarity, accessibility, variety.

First and foremost, it must be clear to students what they are expected to do with their materials. This implies the need to adapt most if not all of the current commercially prepared textbooks to the use of a semi-independent learner. It is ironic that such information about ways of proceeding through most of the "basic texts" has been provided by publishers in a special manual for the teacher's eyes alone. (Dare I suggest that schools considering the adoption of a new FL text buy only teacher's editions for student use?) Adapting existing materials to individualized instruction may entail such activities as the preparation of a checklist of steps a student is expected to take to complete a given learning task. It may entail the writing of supplementary learning packages to drill the student on single concepts or to give the student extra practice either alone or in combination with other students. It may entail, as has been mentioned above, chopping up the publisher's tapes into smaller, more meaningful units and supplementing the commercially prepared taped materials with "homemade" recordings. It may entail the preparation of frequent practice tests which students can take and correct on their own whenever they have reached certain critical points in their learning task. It may entail the creation of special materials to generate conversational practice, based upon the substance of that point in the curriculum at which a given student is working. The main point to remember is that the greater the clarity of the materials (including whatever adaptations have been produced), the fewer the demands for aid the learner is likely to make upon the teacher's time, and the greater the satisfaction the learner is likely to receive from being able to progress on his own for an extended period.

Materials must not only be clear; they must also be accessible to learners at all times. If students have to interrupt their teacher constantly for copies of this or that practice test, or for permission to get the tape recorder locked in the cabinet, neither they nor their teacher will get very much accomplished. Materials should be placed where students can get at them, and students should be *informed* of where all materials may be found. This is especially true for "machines." If the foreign language program possesses any "hardware" such as tape or cassette recorders, slide projectors, overhead or filmstrip projectors, pathescopes, etc., these should be strategically placed around the room, or located in an accessible "media center" to which stu-

dents may feel free to go whenever they wish, and all students should be trained to operate all equipment. One of the tragic ironies of our profession's experiences with "hardware" to date has been the expenditure of vast sums of NDEA funds for the purchase of electromechanical equipment which now sits abused or unused in locked closets or inaccessible language laboratories.

Materials must be clear; they must also be accessible; and there should be a variety of different curricular materials to suit the differences in learning styles of a heterogeneous body of students. This does not mean that schools or colleges have to purchase complete sets of dozens of different textbooks. Many students study a foreign language with similar goals in mind and with similar abilities. Such learners may well profit from the same curricular materials. It does mean, however, that teachers ought to avail themselves and their students of at least a few copies of a wide range of texts and other materials, so that a student who feels uncomfortable with, or unable to make continued progress in, his current text has another option. Frustration with language learning is less likely to befall a student who has the option of attacking his objectives by another route. Since indidviduals learn differently, it goes without saying that not all students will learn comfortably from the same approach, no matter how clear the textbook's presentation may seem to the teacher. Thus, the presence of an alternative approach, when needed, may well make the difference between a learner who is making satisfactory progress on his objectives and a disgruntled would-be dropout.

V.

EPILOGUE: A NOTE OF CAUTION

In an article in *Hispania* a number of years ago, J. Clark Jenkins described a tribe of wombats who worshiped "the great god ALM." Uttering meaningless paradigms and frenetically performing substitution drills, the wombats had blind faith in one fundamental principle: "All that is new is good."[15]

Jenkins' purpose in writing this satire was of course to warn of the dangers of blind adherence to any "new orthodoxy." Such a warning seems needed again, as a "mass movement toward individualization" looms in foreign languages on the American educational horizon.

It is true that well-planned and well-executed individualized foreign language programs, at both the high school and college level, often find themselves with an ever increasing enrollment. But this is not true of all programs which have attempted some form of individualized instruction. As is suggested in the Introduction to *Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction: Proceedings of the Stanford Conference*, individualization as we know it today is no pana-

cea for sagging enrollments or morale, and it does not guarantee "relevant" education.[16]

Any foreign language teacher or department considering the adoption of an individualized approach to education must be willing to commit initially *a large amount of time to planning*. When Charles E. Silberman accused the American educational establishment of mindlessness—"the failure to think seriously about purpose or consequence"[17]—he certainly must have had foreign language education centrally in focus. A teacher who is unwilling or unable to take the necessary time to think through the goals of a proposed individualized foreign language program, and to develop, adapt, or somehow acquire curricular materials which will enable each learner to understand clearly what he is expected to do—such a teacher has no time to individualize instruction. Successful individualized foreign language programs involve considerably more introspection on the teacher's part than simply making the decision to "give the student an extra book to read."

The decision to individualize a *good* foreign language program may well result in an even better one; the decision to individualize a *bad* foreign language program will almost surely result in total disaster. Individualization can not cure the ills incumbent in a foreign language program where (a) students receive little or no practice in the use of language as communication; (b) the teacher can not or does not speak the target language; (c) the teacher is unable or unwilling to view students as individuals with distinct learning abilities and learning preferences; (d) the curriculum is viewed as predetermined and inflexible; (e) students are given no opportunity to make any of the decisions affecting what and how they learn; (f) the foreign language is viewed by students as simply a vehicle for drills and grammatical exercises; (g) there is little or no cultural content to the language instruction.

The opportunity to individualize and personalize instruction offers a challenge to foreign language teachers at all levels, and this challenge can and hopefully will be met. It will take a great deal of time; it will require patience and trust; it will demand a flexibility of action and attitude; it will force the classroom teacher to be even better prepared than ever before; it will tax his inventiveness and imagination to the limits.

Is it worth it? The following answer is offered by one high school teacher whose foreign language program has been individualized for several years and who is continuously modifying his program to make individualized instruction ever more successful.

> We know we have something vastly better and more successful than what we had, but we also know that a whole new field has opened up that needs exploring and perfecting. This

is a whole new ball game. It is going to be interesting to see how it develops and what changes will slowly occur as we receive feedback from students. The answer, of course, is going to be ever more individualization, not just self-pacing, but real individualization of content, method, and motivation.[16]

REFERENCES

[1] Howard B. Altman and Robert L. Politzer, eds., *Individualizing Foreign guage Instruction: Proceedings of the Stanford Conference.* Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 1971.

[2] Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock.* New York: Random House, 1970. See especially Chapter 18 entitled "Education in the Future Tense."

[3] Carlton W. Washburne, "Introduction and Summary," in G. M. Whipple, ed., *Adapting Schools to Individual Differences.* Twenty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1925, p. x.

[4] Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education.* New York: Random House, 1970.

[5] Altman and Politzer, p. viii.

[6] Florence Steiner, "Individualized Instruction," *MLJ* 55:6 (October, 1971), p. 365.

[7] Robert L. Politzer, "Toward Individualization in Foreign Language Teaching," *MLJ* 55:4 (April, 1971), p. 209.

[8] John B. Carroll, "A Model of School Learning," *Teachers College Record* 64 (1963), pp. 723-33.

[9] Benjamin S. Bloom, "Learning for Mastery," UCLA-CSEIP *Evaluation Comment* 1:2 (1968).

[10] Steiner, p. 366.

[11] Robert McLennan, "How Do We Allow FL Students to Learn at Optimum Rates?" *American Foreign Language Teacher* 1:3 (February, 1971), p. 9.

[12] conducted by Robert A. Morrey and Howard B. Altman during the academic year 1970-71. For a fuller discussion of this survey, see Robert A. Morrey, "The Attitudes of Students and Teachers to Individualized Foreign Language Instruction," in Altman and Politzer, pp. 21-51.

[13] John B. Carroll, "Research in Foreign Language Teaching: The Last Five Years," in Robert G. Mead, Jr., ed., *Language Teaching: Broader Contexts.* Reports of the Working Committee, Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. New York: MLA-ACTFL Materials Center, 1966, p. 13f.

[14] information provided courtesy of Mr. Gerald E. Logan, Chairman, Department of Foreign Languages, Live Oak High School, Morgan Hill, California 95037.

[15] J. Clark Jenkins, "Come Wombats and Worship," *Hispania* 47:1 (March, 1964), pp. 121-23.

[16] Altman and Politzer, p. viii.

[17] Silberman, p. 11.

[18] quoted by Robert A. Morrey in Altman and Politzer, p. 40.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WRITINGS ON INDIVIDUALIZED FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

A. Books

Altman, Howard B. and Robert L. Politzer, eds. *Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction: Proceedings of the Stanford Conference.* Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 1971. ($4.50, paperback)

Altman, Howard B., ed. *Inidvidualized Foreign Language Instruction: A Book of Readings.* Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, forthcoming.

Gougher, Ronald L., ed. *Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction: A Practical Guide.* Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development, Inc., forthcoming

B. Articles

Altman, Howard B. "Individualized Foreign Language Instruction: What Does It Mean?" *Foreign Language Annals* 4:4 (May, 1971), p. 421f.

———. "Toward a Definition of Individualized Foreign Language Instruction," *American Foreign Language Teacher* 1:3 (February, 1971), p. 12f.

——— and Arnulfo G. Ramirez. "Beyond Micro-Teaching: Some First Steps in Individualizing Preservice Training for Foreign Language Teachers," *Modern Language Journal* 55:5 (May, 1971), pp. 276-80.

Benardo, Leo. "Individual Differences in Foreign Language Learning in the Junior High School," in Marvin Wasserman, ed., *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Annual Foreign Language Conference at New York University.* New York: New York University, 1966, pp. 12-14.

Carroll, John B. "Individual Differences in Foreign Language Learning," in Marvin Wasserman, ed., *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Annual Foreign Language Conference at New York University.* New York: New York University, 1966, pp. 3-11.

Bockman, John F. and Ronald L. Gougher, eds. *Individualization of Foreign Language Learning in America.* A continuing Newsletter published by West Chester State College, West Chester, Pennsylvania. Bockman and Gougher also edit a continuing column on "Individualized Instruction" in *Foreign Language Annals.*

Jakobovits, Leon A. "Procedural Steps in Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction," *Foreign Language Annals* 5:1 (October, 1971), pp. 96-98.

Jarvis, Gilbert A. "Individualized Learning—Where Can We Risk Compromise?" *Modern Language Journal* 55:6 (October, 1971), pp. 375-78.

Logan, Gerald E. "A Comment on Including Culture in an Individualized Foreigh Language Program," *Foreign Language Annals* 5:1 (October, 1971), pp. 99-101.

———. "Curricula for Individualized Instruction," in Dale L. Lange,

ed., *Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education*, vol. II. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1970, pp. 133-55.

McLennan, Robert. "How Do We Allow FL Students to Learn at Optimum Rates?" *American Foreign Language Teacher* I:3 (February, 1971). pp. 8-11.

Politzer, Robert L. "*Toward Individualization in Foreign Language Teaching*," *Modern Language Journal* 55:4 (April, 1971), pp. 207-12.

Reinert, Harry. "Practical Guide to Individualization," *Modern Language Journal* 55:3 (March, 1971), pp. 156-63.

Shepherd, W. Everitt. "An Experiment in Individualized Advanced French," *Foreign Language Annals* 3:3 (March, 1970), pp. 394-99.

Strasheim, Lorraine A. "A Rationale for the Individualization and Personalization of Foreign Language Instruction," in Dale L. Lange, ed., *Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education*, vol. II. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1970, pp. 15-34.

———. "Is Foreign-Language Study Relevant for American Students in the 1970's?" in Sanford Newell, ed., *Dimension: Languages 70. Proceedings of the Sixth Southern Conference on Language Teaching*. New York: MLA-ACTFL Materials Center, 1970, pp. 24-35.

Steiner, Florence. "Individualized Instruction," *Modern Language Journal* 55:6 (October, 1971), pp. 361-74.

Teaching Language Through Literature

Jeanne Varney Pleasants
Columbia University

It is a pleasure to be here today and to have the privilege of speaking to you on one of the most crucial aspects of the teaching and the learning of a foreign language in the secondary schools or at the college level: teaching and learning that language through its literature. Of course, it does not imply that learning the language is done exclusively through literature but that literature is one of its most essential approaches.

These principles seem to me as valid today as they were—and I believe will be — throughout the varied eras of foreign language teaching and learning, be it the *Reading Era* (reading and writing) with its emphasis on descriptive grammar and translation, or the *New Key Era* (or the *Audio-Lingual Era*) with its emphasis on structural grammar through patterns to be taught, and learned, both in the classroom and the language laboratory, patterns illustrated by accompanying pre-fabricated dialogues to be memorized, or the *Individualized FL Instruction Era* which we are presently going through and which takes on a "number of shapes and forms." Soon to come will be the *Transformational-Generative-Grammar Era*, already in the making and which, according to some, is already the tolling bell of the last remnants of Structural Grammar as we have known it.

We know the reproaches hurled at the *Reading Era:* the lack of oral proficiency both in speaking and in understanding after three or four and even more years of foreign language study in school or college; and for the reading performance: too little of *good* literature and hardly any valuable participation by the students: "their poor translations"—even with a "poney"—and "superficial résumés."

The *New Key Era* with its phenomenal stress placed upon the spoken language seemed in many cases to make the acquisition of oral fluency and aural ability an end in itself. The importance accorded to the audio-lingual training had, in more than one school, limited the utilization of electronic devices to the mere acquisition of patterns supposedly enabling the students, through sets of pre-established dialogues susceptible of varied manipulations, to do well in what was currently called an "everyday situation": going to school, going to church, going to market, going to the library, going to a

restaurant, meeting Mary, or Helen, or John, or Roger, buying theater tickets, plane tickets, boat tickets, etc., in which the buying a ticket and the taking the train to Versailles, for example, was much more imporant than Versailles itself, thus confining life activities to concrete but trivial situations. Situations excellent for the Berlitz School, its aims and clientele, but vastly insufficient for a liberal education. But that endeavor, as you know, did not bring the anticipated results. Far from it: the last four or five years, an imposing number of controlled experiments, of surveys, reports, articles have revealed its dismal failure. We witness today, in many quarters, as complete a disaffection for pattern teaching, structural grammar, pre-fabricated dialogues and language laboratories as the frenzied enthusiasm of fifteen years ago.

The *Individualized FL Instruction Era* is still in the process of being defined and developed and we are assured that it will not be a "monolithic new wave." Many put great hopes in it and one teacher predicts "the exquisite productivity of custom-tailored-instruction" five years from now in the classes of those teachers who will personally experience the possibility of individualization to a supreme degree.[1]

As to the *Transformational-Generative-Grammar Era*, although born in the theoretical domain quite a while ago, it is yet too soon, for most interested in applied linguistics, to make predictions and form judgments; but some linguists seem to look eagerly to the benefits of this "revolutionary new movement."[2]

There is today, more than ever before, a great deal of discussion on the *aims* of learning a FL and the best ways of learning it. But there is no consensus. And on the place, and use, and experience of literature during the process of learning that language, there is still more disagreement.

But we have to come to terms, to some sort of consensus at this time, in the 1970s when we teachers of FL are "at a crossroads in so far as pedagogical approaches and values are concerned and when we as a profession are under fire because of our supposed lack of relevance to the American student of the 1970s."

Let's start first with what should be the goals, in general, in a liberal institution, of learning a foreign language.

To my mind, and to the minds of a number of our colleagues, the goals for the learner of a FL are, and the one hand, to *assimilate* the mechanisms of the FL, which will permit him through audio-lingual-reading progress to have windows open on a world until then unknown to him, to *see* new vistas; on the other hand, to have this learning process develop his intellectual qualities, open his mind, enable him to acquire a broader understanding of Man, his passions, his problems, his dreams, his hopes. In addition, the confrontation

of "the familiar by the foreign brings about two results: an awareness of one's own cultural processes and a realization that other processes may be equally satisfying to other groups."[1] Thus the learner is able to form valid judgments and to live *not* as a stranger, *not* as an enemy, *not* as a superior, *not* with indifference, but as a friend, as a brother, in a World Without Walls.

These processes will result in the learner *really* knowing the language. By *knowing* the FL we then do mean to, at the same time, *understand* the spoken language, in conversation, on the radio and television, in a lecture, in a play being performed; *be able* to speak without ridicule: vocabulary, grammatical structures, sounds, intonations, rhythms; *read* with relative ease non-technical modern books and articles; *write* in a relatively correct way, it being understood that all these activities did rest, from the beginning and at all levels, on the most *authentic* manifestations, cultural traits, and attitudes characteristic of the country and the people whose language is being learned and, most important, from the beginning, on texts from great writers *(des écrivains de qualité)* of that country, since it is they who reveal most authentically those traits and attitudes. The "substance of their works is nothing but human life."

But in order to reach these goals, the student of the 1970s as well as the student of the preceding generations, must WORK. A FL is not learned overnight. We know that some students today, just as some students before, do not agree. This is not new, of course.

One cannot learn, really learn a FL without hard work. But the work does not have to be boring as, alas! too many FL programs have been and still are. Drills can be varied and not soporifically repetitive *ad nauseam* both in the number of examples of a given structure and in the lack of real subject matter. And I mean repetitive! (The extraordinary number of selling grammars today utterly empty of intelligent, living, challenging, humane, adult subject matter is unbelievable!)

The *National Humanities Faculty* for the last three years since its inception in 1968, has been developing a program, in English, to create meaningful humanities programs for inner city students which sounds to me worthy of adapting in our FL courses. I shall quote at length:

"In the 11th grade class, entitled 'Who Are We?' students move from basic biographical evaluations of themselves, their backgrounds and attitudes to wider considerations of their neighbors, their community and their nation. Encouraged to do field work and rudimentary library research and to employ such tools as videotapes, drawings, scrapbooks and photographs to supplement written work, pupils are also frequently brought together in discussion groups. There,

they pool their findings in broad considerations of various life styles and cultural patterns, of how these have developed and how they interact. Twelfth-graders are encouraged to pursue year-long projects of wide-ranging independent research with explicit attention to the processes of inference and reasoning.

"One result [. . .] has been the discovery that the most successful work in the humanities at the school level has most often occurred in programs built around themes or questions of major and timeless importance. Young people who so often seem completely closed to any study of the past, can be re-engaged with a study of man's experience of all kinds and of all periods if the program leads them from the present to the past by investigating an issue of current concern, and searching out the insights of many disciplines and many ages which lead to fuller understandings.

"The value of this thematic approach, coupled with the concern felt by many people in our society at large [. . .] for the changing patterns—some would say the dissolution—of authority in our times has led the NHF Board to undertake an expanded project [. . .] *The question of Authority.* The project will involve Faculty members [. . .] working with approximately one hundred school teachers and administrators in an investigation of the concept of authority as manifested in many areas of human experience and historic periods [. . .] It should perhaps be emphasized that this work is not intended as a means to restore 'law and order' in the narrow sense in which that phrase is sometimes currently used. It is rather an attempt to help teachers build work around the concept of authority which is at the core of all civilized experience, and to bring youngsters to deeper understanding of the concept, of its importance to them, of its abuses, and of the consideration which vast numbers of pholosophers, religious leaders, historians, artists, and many others have given this concept."[5]

This approach is worth investigating for us FL teachers. We could adapt it and extend the inquiry of the 1970s students further, to that of a foreign country and people essentially through its literature, and doing it IN THE FL ITSELF.

But let's not fool ourselves and the students: let's not forget that such discussions can be fruitful and rewarding in the FL, ONLY if it is carried in a reasonably correct, comprehensible language, and this means correct sounds, correct rhythms, correct intonations, correct grammatical structures, precise vocabulary. We still have to learn, in speaking, in hearing, in writing, in reading, such things as feminine/masculine, singular and plural, active/passive, present, past, future, word order, etc. This is not learned overnight, not indeed from Friday to Monday morning.

What is the *place*, then, in this teaching of the FL of literature?

On the place, and use, and experience of literature during the process of learning the FL, there was, and there is still, strong disagreement.

An impressive number of articles and reports have been written as well as conferences and discussions held. Since 1954, the NCTFL itself has appointed eleven different committees (most of them dealing directly and indirectly) with the place, the use, the experience of literature in FL and held eleven different such discussions and published their respective reports. Books, articles, reports continue to appear. There is no consensus.

A rapid survey of the main attitudes of the profession these last two decades does not seem superfluous:

Many hold the view that "literature is remote and difficult and in some ways separated from the language, that it should be reserved for late study by the few" after the language has been acquired and that using literature to learn the FL " is an insult to literature."[6]

Other FL teachers, however, assert that after a few semesters of pattern and dialogue drills, literature should be an aid "to developing further the ability to communicate with reasonable accuracy and to read with assurance and understanding." The time for reading literature for its own sake and not for critical analysis or for the history of ideas, is at the lower levels and should proceed hand in hand with the acquisition of language proficiency. "There is no better means to develop proficiency or to supply material for lively oral exercise than a well-chosen literary text. We all know, from humiliating experience, how impossible or inane it is to promote conversation without a subject to converse about."[7] "Manufactured" material must be "kept to a minimum [. . .] Too often the content of what we offer juniors and seniors in secondary schools appears naive when compared with the kind of work required of them in their history or English classes."[8] The last two teachers recommend memorization of poems, prose passages of great value and insist on the fact that these poems or prose excerpts give basic speech patterns, rhythmic and structural patterns, and that an early acquaintance with good literature can be an aid rather than a handicap in the acquisition of linguistic proficiency. For this last group, however, the lower levels are the third and fourth years of secondary school FL or second year of college.

The two groups of teachers I have just discussed mean by literature: *authentic* literature, *authentic* literary texts, works of genuine literary value.

There is another group, a large group, which advocates the reading of "literature" at the third year high school or second year col-

lege. At that stage they recommend *adapted* and/or edited selections from literature, preferably the adaptation of *less-known* authors![9]

A fourth group of FL teachers, firmly believes and advocates the use of authentic literary texts in *early* FL learning, as early as the first semester:

Professor Roger Shattuck, in an article entitled: "The Role of Literature in Foreign Language Instruction,"[10] declares that "The only structure of words which can begin to offer an adult the excitement and mental discipline of rudimentary verbal expression for a child is *literature*. It does not merely give information about language and about culture. *It is itself the ultimate embodiment of those two human achievements in a single entity.* [. . .] the constant drill in aural comprehension, oral performance, basic grammar and reading" of the first year in FL learning should, of necessity, be accompanied "almost from the start by a learning and examination of literary texts."

Professor Edward Williamson, in the article entitled "No Language Without Letters," states that there is no reason why passages of literary merit should not be used in the first year for illustration of points of language: sounds, rhythms, intonations, vocabulary, grammatical structures. He criticizes the misconception which militates against a general use of literary works of those who hold the view "that literature is remote and difficult and in some way separated from language, so that it should be reserved for late study by a few." On the contrary, he says, "literature is nothing but unusually significant use of language, and no one has ever found the place where conversation leaves off and literature begins."[11]

"Great literature," wrote Ezra Pound, "is simply language charged with meaning to the utmost."

"To some degree," writes Williamson, "the reluctance to use literary texts represents a belief that when you study literature you do something mysterious and difficult, which is either analyzing structure in terms of image, symbol, contrapuntal pattern, etc., or building up a history by talking about names, dates, schools, trends, and influences. These activities exist and are of great usefulness [. . .] But they come after reading, and have no necessary place in the first experience of literature [. . .] not criticism but experience is the goal."[12]

Another misconception, he continues, "which is often urged against the use of foreign literature is the notion that some knowledge of the language itself provides experience of the culture. This is patently untrue: it is perfectly possible to be illiterate in several languages. The porters of a European hotel can often conduct their dealings in three or four languages but their grasp is limited to the single type

of transaction and they have no acquaintance with the cultures to which the languages relate. The limitation is both linguistic and psychological. The porter can say *by express collect*, but not *The heavens declare the glory of God.*"[13]

For my part, I belong to this last group of FL teachers.

To really learn a FL, the discovery and learning of authentic literary texts from the very first semester is an exciting help and splendid experience. What texts? All *genres*. At first, essentially poetry, but not necessarily only poetry: passages taken from novels, drama, essays. For what aims? First and foremost for sheer enjoyment, to experience "le pouvoir incantatoire" of the FL in authentic and poetic texts of great writers. Then, for the illustration of points of grammar: sounds, rhythms, intonations, grammatical structures, and for discovering most authentic traits, attitudes characteristic of the people whose language one is learning and discover them in that language and, inevitably, to discover and feel how literature in most languages is relevant to contemporary life. With constant contact and familiarity with literary texts from the beginning of language learning, students will be able to undertake the reading and the study of complete literary works with more gratifying results than otherwise, and with relative ease and, often, boundless enjoyment and, meanwhile, they will have a greater awareness of their *own* real interests and their *own* real values and of those of another people, when they differ as well as when they are the same. It is not contradictory: if "literature has a certain universality in that it is concerned with the response of human beings to the world."[14] it is also "l'expression d'une société" (Madame de Stael.). "C'est à travers sa litterature qu'on apprend le mieux un pays étranger." (Simone de Beauvoir.)[15]

Of course, one has to be careful: "Literature can be of great complexity, but it can be very simple and the simple will be used at the beginning for students of moderate linguistic equipment."

Among the simple are an extraordinary number of whimsical poems easy to apprehend and remember with their charming rhythms, sounds, intonations which the student of the 1970s will relish as much as students of other generations.

Among many, Desnos and Prévert[16] are an unending source of such poems. May I quote a few quite characteristic?

Illustration of sounds. In French, *on* and *an*, for example. Early in the first semester, after learning through minimal pairs, to recognize and reproduce the two nasal vowels and observing the total absence of *n* and *m* after the vowel, the student can hear and repeat and then later learn by heart *Le Pélican* of Desnos. With a few pictures, a few gestures, a few simple definitions (in French): *île*,

pondre, *autant*, he can understand, appreciate, enjoy the sounds, the rhythm, the meaning, the music of this whimsical poem:

Le capitaine Jonathan,
Etant âgé de dix-huit ans,
Capture un jour un pélican,
Dans une île d'Extrême-Orient.
Le pélican de Jonathan
Au matin, pond un œuf tout blanc
Et il en sort un pélican
Lui ressemblant étonnamment.

Et ce deuxième pélican
Pond, à son tour un œuf tout blanc
D'où sort inévitablement
Un autre qui en fait autant.

Cela peut durer très longtemps
Si l'on ne fait pas d'omelette avant.

(Chantefables et chantefleurs.)

Instead of this whole poem which, because of its length, may be reserved for later when the two nasals are reviewed, a single sentence, short, meaningful, well-rhythmed, may be learned by the student, a sentence that expresses a concept with which he will soon become familiar throughout his study of the French language and literature: the Cartesian mind exemplified by the famous "Je *pense*, *donc* je suis."

Another example for sounds. The opposition of *ou* an *u*. After the minimal pairs:

ou / eu
sou / su
vous / vu
doux / du
roue / rue
bouche / buche
atout? / as-tu?
Dis-tu doux? / Dis-tu du?

Desnos' *Les Hiboux* is indicated with its emphasis on the energetic French *ou* opposed to the energetic *u* of emphatic *dur:*

Ce sont les mères des hiboux
Qui désiraient chercher les poux
De leurs enfants, leurs petits choux,
En les tenant sur les genoux.

Leurs yeux d'or valent des bijoux,
Leur bec est dur comme les cailloux,
Ils sont doux comme des joujoux,
Mais aux hiboux point de genoux!

Votre histoire se passait où?
Chez les Zoulous? Les Andalous?
Ou dans la cabane bambou?
A Moscou? Ou à Tombouctou?
En Anjou ou dans le Poitou?
Au Pérou ou chez les Manchous?

Hou! Hou!
Pas du tout, c'était chez les fous.

(Chantefables et chantefleurs.)

Specific illustrations of syntactical constructions and vocabulary are to be found by the thousands. Take the past indefinite, for example. The study of the past indefinite in French comes about the seventh or eighth week of the first semester. For past indefinite expressing a succession of finite actions in the past, *Déjeuner du matin*, of Jacques Prévert can be presented:

Il a mis le café
Dans la tasse
Il a mis le lait
Dans la tasse de café
Il a mis le sucre
Dans le café au lait
Avec la petite cuiller
Il a tourné
Il a bu le café au lait
Et il a reposé la tasse
Sans me parler
Il a allumé
Une cigarette
Il a fait des ronds
Avec la fumée
Il a mis les cendres
Dans le cendrier
Sans me parler
Sans me regarder
Il s'est levé
Il a mis
Son chapeau sur sa tête
Il a mis
Son manteau de pluie
Parce qu'il pleuvait
Et il est parti
Sous la pluie
Sans une parole
Sans me regarder
Et moi j'ai pris
Ma tête dans ma main
Et j'ai pleuré

(Paroles.)

There are 15 past indefinites representing 15 finite actions in the past, with 6 irregular verbs that most students by that seventh week have already learned. The balance, 9 regular verbs of the first group, are either already known to them or easy to understand through what many call "sensible guessing."

Such a poem, in which actions in the past are used in context, building a dramatic human situation would give relief to the mo-

notonous, far-from-stimulating, often boring dialogues that the learner was too often subjected to during the *New Key Era* and is still subjected to today in spite of complaints and grumblings. (Not that we should do away completely with them: they have their usefulness, but reduced to a minimum.)

Soon, one can base a whole lesson in class and one in the LL on just such a poem. We have a LL program of fifty minutes[17] on *Déjeuner du matin*, for the first semester, in which among ten exercises, there is one that through leading questions the student has to answer after a re-reading and re-experience of the poem, is an embryo of an *explication de texte*. Of course not the old fashion *explication* with dates, sources, influences, comparisons, etc., but an *explication* concerned with the poem and its inseparable form and content. The student gets involved, participates, begins to feel and understand l'indivisibilité of *forme et fond*. (Of course, authentic literary texts should not be used for grammatical manipulations; the student should not be asked to put the poem in the plural or in the singular, to change the tenses to past, present or future, to transpose the present-future if-clauses to imperfect-conditional if-clauses, etc. Grammatical manipulations are asked of students for sentences similar in construction to those of the poem but, throughout the classroom and the LL lessons, the Poem is respected and kept in its integrity. This does not rule out the use of individual lines—one, two, three and even four at a time forming a unit as illustration of certain points of grammar but these lines must always be used by the student *as the poet wrote them*.[18] Later, in the second or third year, much more complete and richer explications de texte can be elaborated which will involve deeply the learner. For *Recueillement* of Baudelaire, Professor Benamou presents a subtext from which the student, who has read the real poem a first time, becomes actively involved "in the re-creation of beauty; his participation increases the chances that the poem will become alive to him. This is done in the LL which makes his experience a personal effort, not only saving class time for a discussion of the "features" revealed by the subtext but conditioning the student for the discussion which will follow in class in a way impossible to achieve by mere silent homework."[19] A similar approach is used also by Professor Bénamou for Jules Supervielle's *Plein Ciel*.[20]

This type of work and the active participation of the student not only involve the learner deeply but also convince him that translation is inevitably inadequate: it can give the general idea but not the full meaning: "While translations provide an invaluable service in making available to readers ideas which could not otherwise be read in the original," writes Professor Maxine Cutler, "translators cannot surmount the fundamental problem stemming from the uniqueness of the 'coded message' which, by definition, resists alternative expression."[21]

To come back to the first semester of the first year to *Déjeuner du matin:* to the use of the past indefinite can be opposed in the next lesson the use of the imperfect for habitual, repeated actions in the past. Victor Hugo's poems about children, and especially about his daughter Léopoldine are well-known. The following excerpt from one of his best known poems is most easy to apprehend by young learners in the first semester:

> Elle avait pris ce pli dans son âge enfantin
> De venir dans ma chambre un peu chaque matin,
> Je l'attendais ainsi qu'un rayon qu'on espère;
> Elle entrait, et disait: Bonjour, mon petit père!
> Prenait ma plume, ouvrait mes livres, s'asseyait
> Sur mon lit, dérangeait mes papiers, et riait.
> Puis soudain s'en allait comme un oiseau qui passe.
>
> *(Les Contemplations.)*

There, in the last five lines of the excerpt forming a unit, a context, we find nine imperfects expressing habitual actions in the past with seven of the verbs already known to the students in the eighth week of the first semester, and the other two easy to guess. Right there, Victor Hugo's Romantic Alexandrine with some of its characteristic rhythm becomes familiar to the beginning learner.

When the latter battles with the if-clauses, why not for him to choose *Si toutes les filles du monde* of Paul Fort. It is a veritable pattern drill but this time with an idea. And what a relevant text today! for all of us, the young learner and ourselves, unified under the motto: *A World Without Walls:*

> Si toutes les filles du monde voulaient s'donner la main,
> tout autour de la mer elles pourraient faire une ronde.
>
> Si tous les gars du monde voulaient bien être marins,
> ils f'raient avec leurs barques un joli pont sur l'onde.
>
> Alors on pourrait faire une ronde autour du monde,
> Si tous les gens du monde voulaient s'donner la main.
>
> *(Ballades françaises.)*

Or one may choose Corneille's poignant line in the *Cid:*

> *Rodrigue.* Je le ferais encor si j'avais à le faire.

Or Aragon, in a no-less poignant situation: five times in the *Ballade de celui qui chanta dans les supplices,*[22] the poet reiterates that no torture whatever its horror will make him yield or would change his behavior:

Et s'il était à refaire
Je referais ce chemin

For numbers and addition: on the lighter side, *Page d'écriture*, again by Jacques Prévert, is pertinent. How relevant to more than one student of today, or yesterday, or of all the time, for that matter!

Deux et deux quatre
quatre et quatre huit
huit et huit font seize . . .
Répétez! dit le maître
Deux et deux quatre
quatre et quatre huit
huit et huit font seize.
Mais voilà l'oiseau lyre
qui passe dans le ciel
l'enfant le voit
l'enfant l'entend
l'enfant l'appelle
Sauve-moi
joue avec moi
oiseau!
Alor l'oiseau descend
et joue avec l'enfant
Deux et deux quatre . . .
Répétez! dit le maitre
et l'enfant joue
l'oiseau joue avec lui . . .
Quatre et quatre huit
huit et huit font seize
et seize et seize qu'est-ce qu'ils font?
Ils ne font rien seize et seize
et surtout pas trente-deux
de toute façon
et ils s'en vont.

(Paroles.)

Again Desnos. For the eighth or tenth week of the first semester, in a review lesson, a short enjoyable, whimsical poem *La Fourmi*, illustrating vocabulary, some use of two prepositions *(de, avec)*, the present participle, the negative:

Une fourmi de dix-huit mètres
Avec un chapeau sur la tete
Ça n'existe pas, ça n'existe pas.

Une fourmi trainant un char,
Plein de pingouins et de canards,
Ça n'existe pas, ça n'existe pas.

Une fourmi parlant français,
Parlant latin et javanais
Ça n'existe pas, ça n'existe pas.
Eh! Pourquoi pas?

(Chantefables et chantefleurs.)

Many, many literary texts are to be found that can be used in the first year (in the first or second semester) to illustrate, cultural background, together with vocabulary, sounds, rhythms, intonations, grammatical structures. For the theme *Paris Rive Gauche*, elected by some students, why not the following passage of Anatole France? With pictures and a map (chosen by students by consulting the Index card file of the visual props of the school) placed on the wall in the classroom for the purpose:

> Il ne me paraît pas possible qu'on puisse avoir l'esprit tout à fait commun, si l'on fut élevé sur les quais de Paris, en face du Louvre et des Tuileries, près du Palais Mazarin, devant la glorieuse rivière de Seine, qui coule entre les tours, les tourelles et les flèches du vieux Paris. Là, de la rue Guénégaud à la rue du Bac, les boutiques des libraires, des antiquaires et des marchands d'estampes étalent à profusion les plus belles formes de l'art et les plus curieux témoignages du passé. Chaque vitrine est, dans sa grâce bizarre et son pêle-mêle amusant, une séduction pour les yeux et pour l'esprit. Le passant qui sait voir en emporte toujours quelque idée, comme l'oiseau s'envole avec une paille pour son nid.
>
> Puisqu'il y a là des arbres avec des livres, et que les femmes y passent, c'est le plus beau lieu du monde.
>
> *(Le Livre de mon ami.)*

This is *one* passage. But there are many more of Anatole France, Gide, Lacretelle, Giraudoux, Prévert, Aragon, Queneau, Butor, etc., much more enriching and enjoyable than the typical *leçon culturelle* of a number of textbooks, in fact the only *leçon culturelle* of a certain grammar of over 350 pages!

> The most famous monument in Paris is the Eiffel Tower. It is 900 feet high. It was built by the French engineer Eiffel in 1889. It was the highest building of the world until 1931, when the Empire State Building was built in New York: it is 1,104 feet high.

The poor Tour Eiffel reduced today to a mere third rank since the construction of the Trade Center in Manhattan!

There are thousands and thousands of poems and passages of prose that students of FL today will relish IF WE LET THEM HAVE THEM and not hide them as we have been doing too long. And there are thousands that are relevant to today's young American students' interests. Name any subject or theme of interest and value to the 1970 student who has elected to study a FL, French for instance: there will be a host of literary texts that will fascinate him by their relevance to his own interest and enhance the discussion with his classmates who will have chosen that theme with him, and with the teacher who shall *participate* in the discussion (*not lead* the discussion) and, at times, clarify the meaning.

Let's list just a few of those interests of the 1970s students and I shall name a few authors among the *many* who share these interests:

Justice and Injustice: Montaigne, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Anatole France, Zola

The poor incapable of defending themselves: Courteline, Brieux, Anatole France, Céline

Compassion for the underprivileged: Victor Hugo, Maupassant, Céline, Prévert, Rene Char, Eluard

Protestation (direct or indirect) against wars, slavery and/or torture: Montaigne, La Bruyère, all the XVIIIth century *Philosophes*, Victor Hugo, Giraudoux, Céline, Sartre
Protestation against inhuman prison treatment: Montaigne, Montesquieu, Victor Hugo, Malraux

Brotherhood, "camaraderie fraternelle," love of humanity: Saint-Exupery, Romain Rolland, Chennevière:
Je dis que le temps est venu
De déclarer l'amour au monde.

I quoted only French, but in other languages, the choice is also large.

Of course, more than once, judgments or ideas of the young learner will be surprising and even, at first, shocking for us. But this is not new either: it has existed in the past, from generation to generation, at times mildly, at others explosively. But anyway, is it not good to know more about the young student's mind, ideas, emotions, ideals, and to be able, in a lively debate, on a subject that *he* chose, to show our own side, a side that we do not impose on him and his classmates but that we want, and have a right, to express? To the saying: "de la discussion jaillit la lumière" we should add: "and the respect of one another." In addition, more than once the young learner can teach us a thing or two; and through the expression of his deep feelings,

his involvements, his preoccupations, we may better understand why he thinks a certain way even if we do not agree with him, and, do not forget, he with us. Even when authors of the literary texts bearing on his theme are not exactly on the same side with him, even if they are on the opposite side, they will however reveal to him that others have also been deeply involved on the same issue and the more different their conceptions the more lively and fascinating the discussion.

May I conclude this talk by quoting one more literary text that we, my associates, my students and myself used for a lesson based on Voltaire's *Traité sur la Tolérance*, relevant, although written in the XVIIIth century, to American students of the 1970s, in a *World Without Walls!*

This whole book of Voltaire, directed at the pursuit of, and the right to, freedom of religion, can be applied to the pursuit of freedom and equality in general, and the horror of intolerance and fanaticism. The fifty minutes LL lesson contains ten different exercises, the first nine based on a passage from the sixth chapter; the seventh exercise, through a series of questions on the text leads to a sort of *explication de texte* by the students in which *forme et fond* are revealed inseparable; "Le message littéraire est caractérise par le fait qu'on ne peut rien y changer, qu'il n'admet aucune substitution dès le moment où sa composition est achevée."[23]

The last exercise of this LL lesson is a dictation taken from another chapter of the *Traité sur la Tolérance*.[24]

> Extrait de la *Prière à Dieu*, chapitre 23.
>
> Tu ne nous as point donné un cœur pour nous haïr et des mains pour nous égorger; fais que nous nous aidions mutuellement à porter le fardeau d'une vie pénible et passagère; que les petites différences entre les vêtements qui couvrent nos débiles corps, entre tous nos languages insuffisants, entre tous nos usages ridicules, entre toutes nos lois imparfaites, entre toutes nos opinions insensées, entre toutes nos conditions si disproportionnées à nos yeux et si égales devant toi; que toutes ces petites nuances qui distinguent les atomes appelés *hommes* ne soient pas des signaux de haine et de persécution.

I maintain that for the American student of the 1970s, literature as part of the learning of a FL is more relevant than ever. His many "idealistic" ideals, his rebellion against a great many values or attitudes of the preceding generation will find counterparts in other countries, in other peoples. He will be extraordinarily surprised to find in literature, which is, as Edouard Morot-Sir so well stated, "le language de l'homme,"[25] many kindred spirits throughout the centuries, and in

a country (be it France, Spain, Italy, etc.) where he would have suspected their existence the least from his vague and gross previous clichéesque idea of the country.

Let him choose his themes, let him treat and discuss what deeply interests and involves him: you'll be sure that at least *one* literary text (but certainly many more) can be produced that will show that his concern is a human one and that under differences, often superficial, that concern has been, is, and will be the concern of Man throughout the world and throughout the times.

NOTES

The following abbreviations will be used:

FR *The French Review.*

NCTFL *Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.*

Newsletter *Newsletter: Teaching Language Through Literature* (formerly: *The Language Laboratory and the Teaching of Literature*) *Modern Language Association Conference.*

1. Hunter, Madeline, "Tailor Your Teaching to Individualized Instruction," *The Instructor*, LXXIX, 5 (March 1970), pp. 53-63.
2. Moulton, William G., *A Linguistic Guide to Language Learning*, New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1970.
3. Williamson, Edward, "No Language Without Letters," *Italica*, XXXIII, 1 (March 1956), pp. 8-15.
4. In Fournier, Edouard, *Le Théâtre français avant la Renaissance*, 1450-1550, Paris: Laplace, 1872.
5. Richardson, Arleigh, D., "National Humanities Faculty Expands Programs," *The Key Reporter*, XXXVI, 4 (Summer 1971), pp. 1, 8.
6. Nelson, Robert, "The Role of Literature in Foreign Language Learning," *FR*, XXXII, 5 (April 1959), pp. 456-460.
7. Torrey, Norman L. *et al.*, "The Teaching of Literature," *NCTFL*, 1954, pp. 57-61.
8. MacAllister, Archibald T. *et al.*, "The Role of Literature in Language Teaching," *NCTFL*, 1955, pp. 8-11.
9. Scherer, George A. C. *et al.*, "Reading for Meaning," *NCTFL*, 1963, pp. 22-60.
10. Shvetlick, Roger, "The Role of Literature in Foreign Language Instruction," *FR*, XXXI, 5 (April 1958), pp. 420-426.
11. Williamson. See Note 3 above.
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. Baird, Alexander, *Literature Overseas: A Question of Competence*, London, 1969.

15. Cf. Maurice Breziere, "Littérature et Civilisation," *Le Français dans le Monde*, no. 77 (December 1970), pp. 54-58.

16. The two following books are, among many, an inexhaustible source of poems which even beginners of French can appreciate and experience: Desnos, Robert, *Chantefables et chantefleurs*, Paris; Gründ, 1955; Prévert, Jacques, *Paroles*, Paris: Gallimard, 1949.

17. Pleasants, Jeanne Varney, "Language Laboratory Audio Program," *Newsletter*, IV, 1 (November 1964), pp. 15-25.

18. *Id.*, "Literature in Foreign Language Teaching for a Liberal Arts Education," *Newsletter*, I, 1 (December 1961), pp. 1-14.

19. Renaudot, Michel, "A Laboratory Study of Baudelaire's *Recueillement*," *Newsletter*, IV, 1 (November 1964), pp. 26-30.

20. *Id.*, "A Laboratory Study of *Plein Ciel*, by Jules Supervielle," *Newsletter*, III, 2 (April 1964), pp. 17-24.

21. Cutler, Maxine, "Limits of Explication de Texte in Translation. A Comparative Study of L'Etranger in French and in English," *Newsletter* X, 1 (November 1970, pp. 11-23.

22. Aragon, Louis, *La Diane française*, Paris: Seghers, 1945.

23. Riffaterre, Michaël, "Vers la Définition linguistique du style," *Word*, XVII, 3 (December 1961), pp. 318-344.

24. Pleasants, Jeanne Varney, *et al.*, "A Language Laboratory Lesson Based on a Literary Text: Voltaire, *Traité sur la Tolérance*," *Newsletter*, I, 1 (December 1961), pp. 27-36.

25. Morot-Sir, Edouard, "Littérature et action culturelle," *Le Français dans le monde*, no. 77 (December 1970), pp. 10-16.

WORK SESSIONS

The Work Sessions of the Conference were designed for small-group participation by conferees with the specialist in charge. It was not possible in all cases, due to the nature of the discussions, to produce a summary of the Session.

—Ed.

Individualization of FL Instruction

Howard B. Altman

1. There are two words in the phrase "individualized instruction," and *both* have to be equally stressed. That is to say, "individualized instruction" implies *instruction*. Allowing students to "do their own thing" unassisted may well result in *no* instruction. Successful individualized programs also have a definite *structure*, although this may be a far looser structure than that of most non-individualized programs. If the program had no structure at all, it would degenerate into chaos. Students still work under *pressure* in an individualized program, although the pressures often come from different sources from those under which students labor in traditional programs. No longer is the student under pressure to succeed solely to please his teacher or to surpass his classmates. Since mastery of material is always necessary to advance in an individualized program, a student is primarily under pressure to surpass his *own* performance.

2. *Costs:* I have no figures for the cost of individualized foreign language instruction as compared with traditional instruction. I would suspect, however, that individualizing instruction probably requires an initial expenditure of more funds for a foreign language department than is the case with traditional instruction. Once materials are developed or purchased, however, there is no reason to suspect that the basic operating costs of an individualized foreign language program are any higher than those of non-individualized programs. Indeed, the maintenance costs of individualized instruction may even be lower. If a teacher makes use of advanced students as TAs (and paraprofessionals, if available, to serve as "native speaker" models), one classroom teacher can handle at least as many students as in a traditional teacher-centered classroom. At Morgan Hill, California's Live Oak High School, for example, two fulltime teachers, a part-time paraprofessional (on salary), and twenty unsalaried advanced students who work as TAs provide needed instruction for over 250 students in the German program.

3. *Grading and Issuing Credits:* An individualized foreign language program demands learning for mastery. Students can not move ahead in their materials until they demonstrate a genuine knowledge of their current unit of work. Conventional educational systems specifically *exclude* most students from mastery by proclaiming that "there is just so much room at the top." Students' test scores are "curved" to cor-

respond to the so-called "normal (or 'bell') curve of errors"; just so many are allowed to receive "A," so many "B," the majority "C," etc. The fallacy in this is that the scores of a given sample of students will approximate the shape of the "bell curve" *on the basis of chance alone*. If I suddenly administered to this audience of foreign language teachers a test on, let's say, principles of microbiology, and if I provided you with no instruction and no assistance, and if you all did as well on the test as you could, the chances are your scores would fit nicely on a "normal curve" without any adjusting on my part, provided that the sample of test-takers is large enough. But if I provided you with instruction, if I deliberately attempted to influence your knowledge of the subject and thus your performance on the test, your scores ought to be skewed toward the upper end of the curve. Indeed, if my instruction was clear and adequate for you, and if you were willing and able to grasp it in however much time it took you, the chances are practically all of you would get an "A" on the test.

If students are graded on the basis of *criterion-referenced* tests—i.e., if a student is measured by some absolute standard, rather that by the relative performance of his classmates—and if a positive atmosphere for learning prevails (clear instruction, desire and capacity to learn, sufficient time for learning), then practically all students can *master* their foreign language tasks.

Let me cite two systems for grading and issuing credits in individualized foreign language programs, and refer you to the chapter on "Evaluation" in the *Proceedings of the Stanford Conference* for much more detail.

Program X, a high school foreign language program, awards students no credit for time spent in class. If a student sits in the room all year and accomplishes nothing with the degree of accuracy required, he gets no credit for his "work." Credits must be earned through demonstrated performance. In this program, a student receives one unit of credit per unit of work mastered. Thus, if the "average" student masters ten units of work in a school year, *he* receives ten units of credit for FL study. Last year in this program, one student accomplished "two years in one," i.e., twenty units of work in one year, and therefore received twenty units of credit for the year. A second student deliberately worked more slowly than "normal," and accomplished only five units of work during the year. For this he received only five units of credit. The variable, in other words, is the units of credit. Since a student only receives credit for what he has *mastered*, a student is given the choice of achieving 80% on each unit test (for a grade of "B" on that unit), or 90% (for a grade of "A"). He can therefore do ten units of work, get ten units of credit, and receive a grade of either "A" or "B" depending upon which level of accuracy he ultimately achieves. He could also do only one unit of work, and get only one unit of credit, and still receive a

grade of "A" or "B." Report cards are designed to indicate both grade and units of credit earned.

In Program Y, another high school program, the faculty does not believe in variable credits. They believe that students who have less ability and know that they will accomplish less in the same time periods (and therefore receive fewer units of credit), will sign up for something else where they can have their "normal ten units of credit." Therefore, as long as students make a conscious effort to learn (subjectively determined by the faculty), all students receive ten units of credit per year. The standard grade in this program is "B," which is achieved by scoring 85% on all tests. Tests in this program, as in Program X, may be repeated by students who do not "measure up" the first time. Thus, no matter how many units of work a student accomplishes in the year, he receives ten units of credit (assuming his teacher feels he has been consciously making an effort to learn) and a grade of "B" if he achieves 85% accuracy. What if a student wants a grade of "A"? In this program, "A" does not represent a higher level of achievement on a test than "B," but rather the completion of some special project which is student-initiated. One student may want to investigate the cultural implications of his current unit of work, and he offers to prepare some kind of acceptable presentation of his research. Assuming he gets at least 85% accuracy on his unit test, he will receive a grade of "A." Another student may want to do additional work on some of the structural topics covered in the unit and demonstrate in some mutually acceptable way that he has accomplished something. He, too, will get a grade of "A," providing that he, too, can fulfill the requirement for "B."

The systems for grading and issuing credits in Programs X and Y are *composite* systems and, to my knowledge, do not reflect the policies which are practiced in any one program. They are *typical*, however, for the kinds of systems which do exist in such programs. It is significant to note that both systems have something in common: no student ever receives a failing grade. If a student is unable to demonstrate mastery of his unit of work on the test, he has an opportunity to take the test again after additional help and study. If report card time rolls around and he still hasn't passed his test satisfactorily, he receives a grade of "incomplete," or "work in progress." If he *never* achieves mastery of the material, the current FL study is obliterated from his record, as if he had never been there. To be deprived of credit for a lack of success is painful, but not nearly as stigmatic as to have a failing grade indelibly inscribed on one's transcript.

Foreign Languages in the Elementary School and Bilingual Education

Theodore Andersson
University of Texas

In developing the Conference Theme, "A World Without Walls," the Conference orators have been busy dismantling walls, walls between language and literature, between the teacher and the learner, and between the language teacher and various other educational specialists. May I, in an effort to provoke discussion on FLES and bilingual education, call attention to some walls which exist between language teachers and social scientists, walls which also interfere with the free flow of knowledge.

In the early fifties, a low point in the fortunes of foreign languages, growing numbers of FL teachers realized that one reason for the mediocre results they were getting in the classroom was that adolescence and adulthood are peculiarly unfavorable ages for foreign-language learning. Goaded by U.S. Commissioner of Education Earl McGrath, elementary-school, high-school, and college FL teachers began trying to learn how to teach foreign languages in the elementary grades. Cautiously and somewhat reluctantly the Modern Language Association FL Program endorsed the new trend. The caution, if not the reluctance, was well advised, for many FLES programs were doomed to slow or sudden extinction for lack of adequate quality or community support. The failure of individual FLES programs was too often hailed as proof that the FLES *idea* was invalid. In my opinion nothing could be further from the truth. The central principle of FLES, that children, the younger the better, are more effective and more eager learners of languages than adolescents or adults, is as valid now as it has ever been.

By good luck, as the FLES movement faltered—and I am delighted to hear that in Georgia FLES is thriving—along came a new kind of language program, namely, bilingual education. Professional and public interest in bilingual schooling—as I prefer to call it—is still lively and growing. However, this new form of education, which is *not just language education*, also carries within it the seeds of failure through lack of quality—this despite the valiant efforts of many able and dedicated professionals.

But I contend that bilingual schooling is threatened not only by insufficient quality but also because it rests upon an insufficient theoretical base, a base which our colleagues in the social sciences can help supply. Let me cite a few examples.

The experimental work of psychologist Wallace Lambert and his team at McGill as well as of the French School in Toronto, where French is used extensively to teach the various subjects of the curriculum to English-speaking children, is well known. Not until we have studied and understood the implications of such home/school language switches can we learn to use two—and perhaps more—languages as effective means for teaching—that is, allowing children to learn—the various subject areas of the elementary-school curriculum.

We used to think we were pretty revolutionary when we persuaded school administrators to launch FLES programs in grades 3 or 4. And against such stalwart opponents as my good and long-time friends Nelson Brooks and Donald Walsh, I never did win my plea to begin in the kindergarten or in the first grade, at the latest. And now new evidence from the social and medical fields reveals that my point of view was almost as stodgy and ill-founded as theirs.

Less well known than the experimentation of Wallace Lambert is the work over the last twenty years of a group of medical researchers in Philadelphia under the leadership of Dr. Glenn J. Doman, Director of the Institutes for the Achievement of Human Potential. Let me recount how this came to my attention.

One day as I was leafing through a catalog from Aguilar (Madrid) my eye alighted on a fetching picture of a baby and the words "LOS BEBES PUEDEN LEER." I began reading, and found ideas similar to my own notions but going further than I had ever dared. " 'Es verdaderamente sorprendente que hayamos tardado tanto en darnos cuenta de que cuanto más pequeño es un niño cuando aprende a leer, más fácil le resultará leer y mejor leerá.' Y por si quedase alguna duda, concreta [el doctor Doman]: 'Los niños pueden leer palabras cuando tienen un año, frases cuando tienen dos, y libros enteros cuando tienen tres años y les encanta.' . . . En CÓMO ENSEÑAR A LEER A SU BEBE constan ejemplos reales que producen honda admiración una vez superada la idea de que se trata de casos inverosímiles."

Assuming an English original for this book I found the book under the title *How to Teach Your Baby to Read: The Gentle Revolution* (New York: Random House, 1964, 166 pp., $5.95). I read this book with the same fascination and suspension of disbelief as have, apparently, many thousands of parents but relatively few educators. I learned later that Dr. Doman prefers to address himself to mothers rather than to professional educators. On page 104 I found this summarizing passage:

"Beyond two years of age, reading gets harder every year. If your child is five, it will be easier than it would be if he were six. Four is easier still, and three is even easier.

"Two years of age is the best time to begin if you want to expend the least amount of time and energy in teaching your child to read. (Should you be willing to go to a little trouble you can begin at eighteen months, or, if you are very clever, as early as ten months of age.)"

I found all this so intriguing that I invited Dr. Doman to present a paper at the Conference on Child Language that I was organizing and which will take place in Chicago November 22-24, 1971. Let me read you the first three short paragraphs of this paper so that you may sample the flavor of his writing. The title of his paper is "How Brain-Injured Children Learn to Read."

"When you are confronted with a brain-injured two year old who is no further advanced than a new born babe—who gives no evidence of being able to see or hear, let alone crawl or raise his head—teaching him to read isn't the first thing you think about. What you think about is how to get through to him, by any method, on any level.

"Young Tommie was such a child. His eyes wouldn't follow you, or follow a light, or work together. A loud noise would make him start. You could pinch him and get no reaction. In fact, the first time we ever got a reaction out of Tommie was when we stuck pins in him: he smiled. It was a great moment, for us and for him. We had established contact.

"That was when Tommie was two. By the time he was four he was reading, and thereby hangs the tale. Let me tell it to you just as it happened, because we didn't set out to teach him to read, it just happened along the way, as part of our overall problem of establishing communication."

At almost the same time that I discovered Dr. Doman I received a letter from Mrs. Ragnhild Soderbergh, Docent, i.e., Associate Professor, in the Institute of Northern Languages, Stockholm University, describing a research project she was conducting on the learning of syntax by children between the ages of two and five, "using the Doman method." Some weeks ago I received a gift copy of her book entitled *Reading in Early Childhood: A Linguistic Study of a Swedish Preschool Child's Gradual Acquisition of Reading Ability* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell [Gamla Brogatan 26], 1971, 161 pp.), which described in detail how she taught her daughter to read between the ages of two years four months and three years six months, that is, within a period of fourteen months.

Let me read you her last two paragraphs, and then I'll stop.

"At about the age of three and a half the girl began trying to write letters herself. For some reason she concentrated on the capitals. By June of 1967 [age three years nine months] she could write all capitals except B, J, M. N, Q, U, V and X; in July only X was still missing, and she then also failed to write G and Y. On the 1st of November, 1967 [age four years two months], I tested her again and found that she then could write the whole alphabet. . . . By that time she had also begun to write little missives to invented persons.

"When the girl was four and a half her spelling had already become remarkably good. Now, at the age of seven and a half, she simply knows how to spell and needs not devote any time to learning how. This skill, which is normally obtained only after many years of hard school work, had come to her quite unconsciously as a by-product of her early reading. Would it not be a good thing if all children had this experience: of learning to read as easily as they learn to talk and of learning to spell without knowing that they are learning how; of having attained full literacy at an age when children normally begin to learn the ABC? During the first school years a lot of time and hard work is now being devoted to acquiring the elementary skills of reading and spelling. With these skills already at the child's command there could be time for more meaningful and stimulating work and activities at school. Thus still more could be made of the wonderful, receptive and harmonious years before puberty."

Dr. Soderbergh points out the need to test many children in order to validate her study and Dr. Doman's theories, but you will agree with me that the preliminary evidence is highly promising. I submit that not until we have fully digested such experiments as these and built their implications into new forms of schooling can we be confident that we are developing our education—and not just language education—on a firm theoretical base.

The Georgia FLES-TV Program: "Viva Nuestra Amistad" (VNA)

Yvonne de Wright
Instructional Television Development Specialist
Georgia State Department of Education

Viva Nuestra Amistad is an integrated, articulated four-year elementary Spanish ITV series directed to elementary school pupils beginning at Grade 3. The fourth-year telecourse is usable in Grades 6-12.

Aims and Purposes

The purpose of the total series is to provide foundation learning in the sound system and structure of the Spanish language and in Hispanic culture. As the title of the telecourses implies, it is hoped that friendship and better understanding between the English and the Spanish-speaking peoples will be a by-product of the series. The program design emphasizes the importance of language as a tool of communication within a given culture and the necessity of cross-cultural understanding to convey meaning. The aims of the total program are:

1. To build language skills in listening-comprehension, speaking, reading and writing, with major emphasis given to the audio-lingual skills

2. To develop an awareness of and a sensitivity to another pattern of culture

3. To foster tolerance and understanding of cultural differences and value systems of different peoples

4. To contribute to the student's intellectual, social, aesthetic, and emotional growth

Telecourse Development

The linguistic framework of the series is based on the elementary Spanish material published by the Holt, Rinehart and Winston Company, namely, the *Introducing Spanish*, *Primer Curso* and *Segundo Curso* texts. Linguistic continuity is thus assured from one level to the next, and problems in articulation between the elementary, junior and senior high school levels are minimized. *Viva Nuestra Amistad*

I-IV gives a basic background to terminal language students and also lays the necessary groundwork on which to build to continuing language students.

In the cultural area, the first three series have been developed within the framework of an expanding environment, starting with the home and the family, extending into the neighborhood and the community, and then going beyond the city across national boundaries. There is a person-to-person orientation and an immediacy of environment depicted as realistically as possible within the limited context of a beginning foreign language experience.

Language and Culture

Language is always presented in its cultural context, so that both aspects are constantly emphasized. The first three courses are presented entirely in Spanish. There is a gradual advancement from the beginning stages of language learning to slightly more sophisticated levels. Some of the material is introduced for passive understanding only, but there is constant re-entry of familiar material in different contexts to allow work in more advanced phases beyond imitation and repetition—variation and limited selection. Such language manipulation does allow pupils a certain amount of self-expression within the limited content learned, but the primary linguistic emphasis of the series is to re-enforce good listening and pronunciation habits and to strengthen listening comprehension skills. Reading and writing skills are introduced in Step III.

The primary cultural emphasis is to create an awareness, understanding, and acceptance of some of the behavioral patterns that are a part of everyday living in the Hispanic world. The importance of personal relationships in the home and the community is shown throughout the series. In Step I the action revolves around the activities of six families living on the same street, with one exception of a related family living in the countryside. The child's world is purposely limited to those things which interest him most: his family, his friends, his pets, and the fun activities that he can engage in with these people, which primarily include games and food, with such social diversions as birthday parties.

In Step II two important social institutions, the school and the church, are briefly presented. The family unit is still the nucleus, but it is seen as the extended family unit in which grandparents, uncles, aunts and cousins play an increasingly important role in the lives of the children. The children engage in more different activities with more family members; these take them outside the boundaries of their own homes into the city and to the countryside. They become aware of different kinds of work and professions as they begin to get acquainted with certain aspects of community life.

Step III shows more of the community and the activities taking place within it, which introduces many new people of varied ethnic backgrounds and different socio-economic levels. The community has extended its own boundaries to the city and beyond, to another city, where some of the same activities with which we are already familiar are also taking place, but in a slightly different way. For example, school is held at a different time of year because of the reversal of seasons in the southern hemisphere. Group activities receive more attention at this level, with participation in different sports and with party and holiday celebrations on a grander scale. Social situations include boy-girl encounters and some interaction between people of different backgrounds is seen in scenes dealing with shopping. Conceptualization as to how Spanish-speaking people view the world is introduced in Step III and dealt with in more depth in Step IV.

Program Development and Classroom Implementation

Foreign language consultants at the state, local and national levels have served as advisors to the total series. The teleseries, now in the fourth year of development and production, is being used in classrooms throughout the State of Georgia through the facilities of the Georgia ETV Network. The teleseries itself has been and is being developed and produced under the auspices of the Georgia State Department of Education, which is also responsible for the accompanying teacher-training series and most of the support materials. Manual materials and classroom testing of Steps I-III were obtained through a Title III ESEA Project with the Cartersville City Schools. Close collaboration between many people in different educational agencies as well as those in the Spanish-speaking community has existed throughout the entire series.

A multi-media team-teaching approach is used in classroom implementation. The elementary classroom teacher and the Spanish teacher work cooperatively to provide daily language and culture instruction for their pupils (approximately 20-30 minutes a day), using the teleseries as the core of their program. To give the necessary reinforcement and extension of the linguistic and cultural material presented in the telecasts, the following support materials are available to participating teachers in each level of instruction: 1) teacher's manual with lesson plans, 2) audio tape reviews and resource lessons, 3) visuals, 4) pupil texts for Steps III & IX, 5) an optional testing program, and 6) a televised teacher-training series.

Viva Nuestra Amistad IV

The nature of the Step IV series varies from that of the preceding ones in that there is no oral practice of the Spanish sentences spoken and/or read during the telecasts, and in the use of both English and Spanish

in contrast to the exclusive use of Spanish heretofore. The purpose of the bilingual interdisciplinary approach used at this level is to allow greater in-depth treatment of some of the broad cultural areas presented in the earlier courses. Spanish language work is still continued in the classroom, with more work done with the reading and writing skills in addition to the audio-lingual skills.

In addition to showing the way of life of the Spanish-speaking peoples by depicting events in their daily lives, some of the presentations are designed to formulate a beginning understanding as to how Spanish-speaking peoples view the world. Content development is centered around two major categories: 1) the framework of the Hispanic socio-cultural system, and 2) the specific regions of the world where Spanish is spoken. Cross-cultural influences are noted as different aspects of the geography, history, technology, aesthetics, education, world view and economic, social and political organization are presented.

The television presentations are designed to create a kaleidoscope, a composite of visual and sound images related to happenings, feelings, and past and present customs, traditions, thoughts and ideas of the Spanish-speaking people as well as their future aspirations. The approach is of a realistic, objective documentary nature on the one hand, showing what exists and where it exists, and of a subjective reality on the other hand, with natives from the Spanish-speaking world revealing how they see their countries and themselves, both as they think they are, and as they would like for them to be.

Student's Role

The student, then, is to extrapolate reality as he sees it, forming his own concepts through his own insight and understanding of the given situation. Ever present in the series is the theme of "multiplicity in one" of the Hispanic world filled with great diversity and contrasts as well as a common heritage of traditions and beliefs. The teacher in the classroom is the key figure and essential guide in converting the aims of *Viva Nuestra Amistad* into a living reality and in helping each student to reach his own potential.

Metaphor, Black Discourse Style, and Cultural Reality

Grace Sims Holt
Department of Speech
University of Illinois
Chicago Circle

INTRODUCTION

Our current state of knowledge about cultural-linguistic differences, especially those of Blacks, has led us to thresholds of new knowledge in an ever-expanding process. Within a number of disciplines there is presently a vigorous effort to reassess, rethink and reformulate the body of concepts and theory of those American social groups labeled "disadvantaged." In this effort, scholars in numerous disciplines agree that there is some "powerful factor of difference" in Black students heretofore unrecognized. One result of this agreement is an attitudinal change reflected in: 1) statements of awareness, acceptance of and respect for the Black child's culture and language as an educational resource, and 2) statements of conflicting values, life styles, and patterns of functions of speech communication behavior with those of school and the dominant society.

The attitudinal change of educators and researchers is of such significance that we must constantly be aware of the need to definitively state and clarify our reformulated concepts and theories with authentic data on the one hand and to challenge educators to use that data for *developmental* purposes on the other. We cannot again risk betrayal of Black children by defiling a promising prescription, i.e., using the child's cultural resources, which promises good riddance of the undemocratic attitude that undermines our educational efforts.

It is generally believed that American Blacks communicate differently than other Americans. There is the accompanying belief that Black communication has not achieved the abstract, superior communicative level allegedly attained by mainstream America.

I wish to state a different hypothesis: that Black culture treasures personal humanism and this bias is evidenced in metaphor. Thus we have metaphor to express commitment to self-personification, personal attachment, and involvement.

To paraphrase a famous American, "let me make this perfectly clear," all Blacks are not alike. The following analysis presents a cultural norm while at the same time recognizing the existing range of diversity.

Black Metaphor and Communicative Competence

Black parents and teachers have long noted and expressed bewilderment over the striking difference in fluency between scholastic and non-scholastic verbal behavior of Black children. This difference can be accounted for by the students' free choice of language once removed from the rigidity of the classroom. This freedom assumes the form of ethnotropism[1] widely used in Black culture.

—getten over like a fat rat in a cheese factory
—that aint nothin man, ice it
—higher than nine kites on a breezy day
—man that dude was really strokin
—just as cool as she wanted to be
—I don't know what page *you* on
—you on the wrong channel, *tune* in
—Jim he was fakin it and makin it
—I'm gonna *but* your hip boots on
—Lay out till you get wired up
—Layin on the cut till I'm hipped
—Freeze that shit and space

Metaphor, as the most creative and imaginative device of language is the supreme enthnotrope. It shows a capacity for and a developed sense of the beauty and efficacy of language. Metaphor is a high level of abstract symbolization, of logical analogy, describing whatever its meaning symbolizes. It is, according to Langer, "our most striking evidence of abstractive seeing, of the power of human minds to use presentational symbols. . . . Although metaphor conveys all that is essential in the relations symbolized, its meaning is never fixed . . . many concepts may be 'telescoped' into one total expression.[2]

The essential ambiguity of metaphor is usually resolved by the contextual clues, convergent concepts, knowledge and expectations of members of a culture. In conventional standard usage one is taught to avoid ambiguous metaphors for they obscure literal meaning. Nevertheless, there is general admiration of the communicative competence of the person who has mastered skillful use of metaphor. (Communicative competence is a speaker's ability to understand utterances in a variety of rule governed contexts.)

There is an aspect of the process of ideation in metaphorical abstraction which Langer calls "novelty,"[3] and which Winterowd terms "generative power," a power which "explodes with the shock of recognition."[4] The capability of the metaphor to serve as a generative

medium to account for novelty, to seek the similar in the dissimilar makes it the perfect vehicle for transmitting the Black world view.

This knowledge encompasses the speakers' linguistic and cultural codes. A distinction between the two would occur when a person operating from a linguistic code says "no" to mean "no," in contrast with a person operating from a cultural code says "no" to mean "yes."

To understand Black metaphor we must take account of more than just the linguistic features and the elements of the metaphor. We must also account for the reasons for its frequent use in the Black community in order to account for the Black child's competence in the use of metaphor. A measure of a Black speaker's competence is to use metaphor cleverly; a measure of a listener's competence is to be able to derive the speaker's intended meaning.

Gerald Suttles in his study of the inner city, notes that differences in perspective and interpretation lie in "notational devices" that each group relies upon to express and encode their adherence to basic social rules.[5] The use of metaphor as just such a notational device is normative in Black culture and is a part of the data to be inserted in the conceptual and theoretical framework "utilizing the cultural resources of the child."

The Black child's competence in the use of metaphor can be examined in relation to a hypothesis of Sapir which states: The smaller the social circle and the more complex the understandings already arrived at within it, the more economical the act of communication can afford to become. This context has been labeled "high" in contrast to "low" contexts in which "elaborated" type utterances are characteristic.[6]

Black use of metaphor provides the test of Sapir's hypothesis in that it is a direct outgrowth of Black's attempts at survival dealing with "the man" in racist white America. *Going to see the man* may mean going to a job, going to the police station, or making contact with any person in control. Students, when going to class, often say, *I'm going to see the man.* "The man" is the metaphor which symbolizes persons in authority and control, who are usually white. Thus Blacks say *You can't be free when the man's around, Cool it, here comes the man, Cool it with the man,* etc. When Blacks come into contact with whites they often find it useful to maintain a "low profile." Metaphor provides a convenient cover when they wish to do so—talking in riddles as it were.

For example, when metaphors are used by whites to connote negative values about Blacks, Blacks turn those metaphors back on the users by assigning them the same negative values. At the same time, they assign to themselves positive values in the metaphor. Thus, metaphors serve well the function of deliberate ambiguity for Blacks. When whites make errors in pronunciation Blacks say *clumsy lips.*

On the other hand, Blacks may say *clumsy lips* and mean by that a Black who is "really rappin." Similarly, *fuzzy mind* or *childlike mind* may mean either a muddled thinker, or a "deep mind thinker." The subtlety of this way of speaking typifies Black talk.

Communicating a Different Point of View

Metaphor functions as a device for promoting and maintaining the Black world view which is our frame of reference for analysis. The complexity of understandings involved in the frequent use of metaphor (and other ethnotropes) in all probability represents to some degree reinterpretations of the African world view.[7] Since Black Americans are descendants of West Africans from most of the areas along the west coast of Africa, the African world view, in part, still reflects itself in the Black American's use of communication. This view considers communication the art of performance.[8] Performance is a presentation of self which reflects the value of sheer *personal being*, of respect for the individual's integrity in inter-personal relations. Communication is an act to be performed on a stage of life; the creation and sharing of one's *personhood* with others of similar acculturation. For example, a Black convention is to symbolize a "brother" or "sister," as *the greatest* (boxer, singer, talker, etc.), *in the person of* (person's name). Thus, a master of ceremonies introducts Muhammed Ali (Cassius Clay) by saying, *I give you the greatest boxer in the person of Muhammed Ali.* The range of *personhood* oriented metaphors is illustrated by two current metaphors, *You the best businessman* used by poor Blacks, and *Your I.Q. is 135*, or *That's a 135 I.Q.* used by middle-class educated Blacks. Desire to attain the attributes of personal humanism is aided by the cultivation of the art of the created Black metaphor. Blacks are culturally conditioned to create and use their greatest verbal versality in the achievement of "mastery of the metaphor" to control and promulgate the Black world view.[9]

The contemporary metaphors (raps), *That ain't what time it is*, or *He didn't know what time it was* symbolize control of a situation. If a Black person knows that he is being exploited, used, misused, abused, or "helped" for somebody else's benefit, he devises strategies to counteract or overcome the exploiters' intent in some manner which must be concealed from the exploiter. Blacks say "we can't meet the man on his terms, 'cause he always keeps changing the terms." The strategy must be unknown to the exploiter giving the person control of the situation. For example,

"Man, he back"

meaning: 1. back from a particular place
2. back on the general scene
3. back in "the group"
4. back in the crib
5. has cleared up a misunderstanding

6. back from across the racial line
(returned to his own kind)

Ethnotropic control becomes a key device for contending with situational control. To be a master of metaphor is to have *things under control*. Performance is the reality by which the situation is controlled. To seek and project personhood through performance control is "beautiful" (brimming over with meaning). That's what "together" means in *That cat got it all together*, He got his thing all together.

Valuation of creation/invention invites involvement of the "personhood" of all participants in a communication event. Performed reality is viewed as an entity of the speaker/listener which the performer manipulates. The communication created equals the person. Thus the good or excellent "rapper" is honored for controlling situations in such a manner that all involved participants create "personhood" to some degree and profit therefrom.

In Black communicative contexts there is the expectation on the part of all participants of the manupulation of reality control by the speaker in which all participate. Agreement on the principle allows everyone participation in personhood creation. When such verbal routines as signifying, sounding, playing the dozens,[10] etc., are examined from this perspective, they take on new dimensions. Verbal routines are arduously practiced and encouraged in preadolescence to ensure acquisition of the functional rules of performance. Ample time is provided by the culture for practice in developing excellence. Rote verbalizations are usually abandoned as "juvenile" by practitioners who have progressed to the creation of metaphorical language when needed to control a situation. The expert "creator of personhood" is one who creates endlessly ethnotropic language, who uses his skills in novel, inventive ways. The more novel the creation, the more the listener participant is skillfully challenged to accurate interpretation, to discover hidden meaning which can call forth his personhood. (Feelings of self-power are derived when participants symbolically control a situation.) Consider the imagery inherent in the following (which you are invited to translate):

a swinging fox
that cat hit the jill pot
Beautiful!
Different strokes for different folks
Look like Michelle Clark!
Fine! Just like Wine!
That cat has it all together
He got his thing all together
He's with it
He comes out of a beautiful bag
That cat really got his boots laced

He really got stretched out
Look at that rocket take off
Handling the pill
Taking care of business

As previously discussed, numerous functions converge in effective use of metaphorical language which is precisely the drive for reality control that educators seek to eliminate.

Stylistic Control

The Black cultural dynamic integrates a determining idea, ethnotropic mode, and effective style. Ethnotropic utterances generate the capacity to liberate rather than confine creative powers in discourse. This capacity is what W. Ross Winterowd calls the "generative power" relationship between metaphor and symbol which "gives the metaphor the power to fill its own cup of meaning and spill over."[11] "The dialectical process whereby" metaphor conjoins "thesis" and "antitheses" to bring "synthesis" is the very process whereby discourse comes into being."[12]

Significant interaction between metaphors and stylistic control of utterance is a novel way of expressing experience which Blacks understand and evaluate as a prestigious way of learning and knowing. In essence, it is an innovative but cognitive approach to the world which nevertheless, fits the facts in terms of logical relations, patterning and abstraction of community involvement and commitment.

Ethnotropic styling, in part, means *performing* the Black world view using utterances that present a disproportionately high percentage of multiple lexical meanings which are potentially ambig ious. The high rate of in-group interaction produces certain words common to Blacks in the Black community. Words associated with this setting will have systematic different meanings which, used metaphorically become incomprehensible. For example, *He ain't hittin on a dime*, may be translated according to any one or combination of the functions discussed.

Styling may serve as an intentional solecism through which an out-group person who misuses it is excluded; thus it also functions as an exclusionary device. It is clear at this point that a consideration of metaphor in Black communication provides one explanation of why the Black child cannot immediately use in expressive language the isolated words he learns in traditional "vocabulary study." He needs to feed it through his ethnotropic system in order for it to become functional.

The integrative Black world view cannot be projected by using the metaphors of Standard English. Therefore, the invention of the Black metaphor was a cultural necessity. A Black speaker may compose a metaphor (of higher evaluation) or echo one from a repertoire appropriate to the situation in which case the utterances are

alike as to form and meaning. Satisfaction of the cultural pressure for invention, implementation, and creativity accounts for the frequent use of forms which are semantically different (as to linguistic meaning) and which serve the purpose of implementation even though phonetic form of constant, e.g., "bad" to mean "good," etc.

Blacks, like all other speakers, view one meaning as normal, the others as marginal (metaphoric or transferred). It is entirely conceivable that the word *fox* in *She's a real swinging fox* is perceived by Black children as literal. If you've never seen a fox, and constantly are conditioned by repetitive use to think of a pretty female as a fox, it is natural to conclude that a pretty woman or girl *is* a fox.

A recent television newscast reported that a teacher showed a Black kindergartener a picture of a Kangaroo with a baby in its pouch and asked "What is this?" The child replied, "It's a big bank with a little bank inside." There is great pressure in the Black community for imagery "acting orderly" in stylized notations.

The probability of metaphorical association is cumulative and proportional to frequency of possible patterns. Reinforcement contingencies are imposed by the Black community in the form of selectional rules (what can occur with what) which produce utterances associated with Black life. There is no single comprehensive formula, but a totality of complexities clustered around metaphor.

The fact is, comprehending metaphor is crucial in both Black and white cultures. High school prep courses in literature stress the ability to understand metaphors, and certainly college success is dependent upon this ability. For example, passing the initial and final hurdles in rhetoric and English literature courses often rides or falls on this ability. Whereas whites "progress" from literal language to metaphorical language, Blacks "progress" from metaphorical statement to literal statement. The Black child's return to the shared delight in interacting with the complexities of metaphor occurs rarely if at all.

If metaphors can be viewed absolutely as a measure of an advanced level of communicative competence then it ought to be evident that the Black student, by virtue of his cultural processing, has already achieved "mastery of metaphor." Reference to this mastery is made by Rap Brown in *Die Nigger Die!* when he contrasts his competence to that of his teachers. "And the teacher expected me to sit up in class and study poetry after I could run down shit like that [i.e., signifying] if anybody needed to study poetry, she needed to study mine."[13] Black children's expressions are considered "slang" at best and a retarded medium of "wooly thinking" at worst.

CONCLUSION

The current quest for new knowledge, the search for new, creative and innovative change must somehow achieve synthesis with Black

cultural commitments; a synthesis which moves far beyond mere "awareness" and acknowledgment of cultural differences in communication. Future educational decisions must be based on valid definitions of the Black child's communicative competence.

NOTES

1. Ethnotropism is the use of a word or expression in a different cultural sense from that which usually belongs to it for the purpose of *giving life* or *emphasis* to an idea.

2. Langer, Susan K. *Philosophy in a New Key*, p. 125, 164, and 123.

3. Ibid, p. 123 and 124.

4. Wintrowd, W. Ross, "Metaphor and Symbol" *In* Anderson and Stageberg, eds., *Introductory Readings on Language*, Third edition, pp. 215, 216, and 218.

5. Suttles, Gerald D. *The Social Order of Slums: Ethnicity and Territory in the Inner City*, p. 62.

6. Kochman, Thomas. "Black English in the Classroom," In Cazden, Hymes, and John, editors, *The Functions of Language in the Classroom*. See also, "Culture and Communication: Implications for Black English in the Classroom." *The Florida FL Reporter*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 173-74.

7. David Dalby terms such residual elements *African Linguistic Survivals*. See *Black Through White: Patterns of Communication*. Herskovits' influential book, *The Myth of the Negro Past* discusses the significant danger of accepting the myth that Blacks lost all features of African culture when transported to the new world. See also William Stewart's and Beryl Bailey's presentations of structural features in a creole stratum of Black American English, *Linguistic Cultural Differences and American Education*, *Florida FL Reporter*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1969.

8. Holt, Grace. "Changing Frames of Reference in Speech Communication for Black Students." The delineation of performance appears in *Communication Goals for the Urban Teacher*. Language Research Foundation, Cambridge, Massachusetts. The theory is further analyzed and discussed in Grace Holt, *Communication in Black Culture* (in preparation).

9. Richards' concept of command supports this view. "As it grows more abstract we think increasingly by means of metaphors that we profess *not* to be relying on." (p. 92), and "A 'command of metaphor'—a command of the interpretation of metaphors—can go deeper still into the control of the world we make for ourselves to live in. The psycho-analysts have shown us with their discussions of 'transference'—another name for metaphor—how constantly modes of regarding, of loving, of acting, that have developed with one set of things or people, are shifted to another. They have shown us chiefly the pathology of these transferences, cases where the vehicle—the borrowed attitude, the parental fixation, say—tyrannizes over the new situation, the tenor, and behavior is inappropriate. The victim is unable to see the new person except in terms of the old passion and its accidents. He reads the situation only in terms of the figure, the archetypal image, the vehicle. But in healthy growth, tenor and vehicle—the new human relationship and the family constellation—co-operate freely; and the resultant behavior derives in due measure from both. Thus in happy living the same patterns are exemplified and the same risks of error are avoided as in tactful and discerning reading. The general form of the in-

terpretative process is the same, with a small-scale instance—the right understanding of a figure of speech—or with a large scale instance—the conduct of a friendship." Pp. 135-136. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 1936, 1950.

10. For description of these routines see Thomas Kochman, "Rappin' in the Black Ghetto," *Transaction*, 1969. See also, Claudia Mitchell-Kernan, In Thomas Kochman, editor. *Rappin and Stylin Out: Communication in Urban Black America*. "Speech Acts in a Black Urban Community: Signifying, Loud Talking, Marking."

11. Winterowd, p. 215.

12. Ibid., p. 215.

13 Brown, H. Rap. *Die Nigger Die!*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Wallace L. and Norman C. Stageberg. *Introductory Readings on Language*. Third edition, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1933, 1961.

Brown, H. Rap. *Die Nigger Die!* New York: The Dial Press, 1969.

Bruner, J. S. *The Process of Education*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Burke, Kenneth, *Counter-Statement*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.

Dalby, David. *Black Through White: Patterns of Communication*. Hans Wolff Memorial Lecture, Indiana University, Department of African Studies, 1969.

De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Ethics of Ambiguity*. Translated from the French by Bernard Frechtman. New York: The Citadel Press, 1962.

Goffman, E. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Double day and Company, Anchor Books, 1959.

Guilford, J. P. "Three Faces of Intellect." *American Psychologist* 14:469-79. 1959.

Herskovits, Melville. *The Myths of the Negro Past*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941.

Holt, Grace S. "Changing Frames of Reference in Speech Communication Education for Black Students," *The Florida FL Reporter*, Vol. 9, Nos. 1-2, 1971. See also *MLA/ERIC* documents.

Holt, Grace. "Inversion in Black Communication," *The Florida FL Reporter*, Vol. 9, Nos. 1-2, 1971. Also in *Rappin and Stylin Out: Communication in Urban Black America*. University of Illinois Press (In press).

Herskovits, Melville J. "Education and Cultural Dynamics," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 48 (July-May, 1942-43), pp. 737-749.

Kochman, Thomas. "Rappin' in the Black Ghetto." *Transaction*, 1969.

Hymes, Dell. "The Ethnography of Speaking," In Joshua A. Fishman, ed:, *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague. Paris, Mouton, 1968.

Jesperson, Otto, *Language*. London: George Allen and Univin, Ltd., 1922 and 1954.

Kochman, Thomas. *"Black English in the Classroom,"* In Cazden, Hymes, and John, editors, *The Functions of Language in the Classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press (in Press).

Langer, Susan K. *Philosophy in a New Key.* New York: A Mentor Book Published by The New American Library, 1951.

Larson, Richard L. "Invention Once More: A Role for Rhetorical Analysis," *College English*, Vol. 32, No. 6 (March, 1971), pp. 665-672.

Lee, Dorothy. *Freedom and Culture.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1969.

Mitchell-Kernan, Claudia. "Speech Acts in a Black Urban Community: Signifying, Loud Talking, Marking," In Thomas Kochman, editor, *Rappin and Stylin Out: Communication in Urban Black America.* University of Illinois Press (in press).

Nida, Eugene. "Linguistics and Ethnology in Translation Problems," In Dell Hymes, ed., *Language in Culture and Society.* New York: Harper and Row, 1964, pp. 90-97.

Ogden, C. K. and I. A. Richards. *The Meaning of Meaning.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1946.

Reinsch, Lamar N., Jr. "An Investigation of the Effects of the Metaphor and Simile in Persuasive Discourse," *Speech Monographs*, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 2 (June, 1971), pp. 142-145.

Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1936, 1950.

Rose, Peter I., editor. *The Study of Society.* New York: Random House, 1967.

Russell, D. H. *Children's Thinking.* New York: Blaisdell, 1956.

Rosenstein, J. "Concept Development and Language Instruction," *Exceptional Children* 30:337-43, 1964.

Saporta, Sol, editor. *Psycholinguistics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Suttles, Gerald D. *The Social Order of the Slums: Ethnicity and Territory in the Inner City.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, p. 62.

Urban, Wilbur Marshall. *Language and Reality.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961.

Vygotsky, L. S. *Thought and Language* (edited by Eugenia Hanfmann and Gertrude Vakar). Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1962.

Youngren, William. "General Semantics and the Science of Meaning," *College English*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (January, 1968), pp. 253-285.

The Third Dimension of Bilingual Education

Robert Rebert
Bureau of Indian Affairs

When I was asked to represent the Indian schools in this segment of the Conference, I gave a lot of thought to the context in which this group was designed. "ESL for Disadvantaged Groups" means many things to us who are wrestling with the educational disadvantages of Indian students. Like the rest of you, we desperately need better materials, better teacher training, better classroom strategies for teaching English as a second language to our students. I was seriously tempted to give my impressions of where we have been in ESL and some thoughts on where and how I think we should be going in teaching English to Indian, Eskimo and Aleut students. But I became truly inflamed by a "workpaper" written by Russell Campbell at UCLA this summer. It is entitled "Some Thoughts on Bilingual Education for Mexican American Children in California," and it can be found in the June 1971 issue of *Workpapers in TESL from the University of California, Los Angeles.*[1]

At the risk of appearing melodramatic, I will say I was livid when I read the article. Thankfully Mr. Campbell states in his preamble that "It was written with the hope that it will provoke discussion, perhaps even arguments." I, for one, want to argue with the author. The work paper is a clever, if specious, argument in favor of total immersion in English for youngsters whose home language is one other than English. Though Campbell treats specifically of Mexican-American children in California, I have assumed sufficient similarity in second language acquisition problems to apply his thinking to Indian children. And I was astounded to read statements like the following (and I quote) "Ma (sic) children should be immersed in an English curriculum precisely comparable to the curriculum currently employed in Anglo schools and this should be done at the kindergarten age."[2] Again, I repeat, astounding!

Earlier I said that I intended to speak to you about where we have been in ESL for Indian children. I can only ask, where has the writer of that paper been? All these laborious years (brief though they may seem) . . . have our trials and errors and successes been to no avail? Why return to the stone age of ESL and attempt total immersion in English for monolingual non-English speakers when they show

up for their first day of school! I am now tempted to charge these proponents of such educational idiocy with the numbers of drop-outs in the schools for disadvantaged children.

My position in the question of English as a second language focuses on the word "second." I propose and promote that English be taught second in sequence rather than second in terms of substitution. Let us not return to the easy and simplistic approach of total immersion in English.

My position is the one held by those educators who drafted Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, that of bilingual education for young speakers of other tongues in America.

Today I choose to share my thoughts with you about what I call "The Third Dimension of Bilingual Education." A fuller description of the thinking of language education for Indian students can be found in a monograph titled "Bilingual Education for American Indians." (A complimentary copy can be obtained by writing to me at the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Albuquerque, New Mexico.)[3]

Dr. William Mackey, Director of the International Center for Research on Bilingualism in Quebec, says this: "Much of the argument over the effects of Bilingualism is due to the multi-dimensional character of the phenomenon and the great degree of variability of each dimension."[4]

For openers I would like to consider the two basic dimensions of bilingualism as home language and second language. These are the given dimensions of a two-language situation. These could be called the strictly linguistic of language dimensions of bilingualism. I am aware of only some of the others which make up this multi-dimensional character of bilingual education. There are the anthropological, the social, the psychological, the educational, the political, the economic dimensions, to mention a few. And I dare say these dimensions have their many facets. But I have chosen to place in third position the dimension of *choice*.

Later I will get back to that third dimension, so I ask that you remember that I have placed home language as the first dimension, English as the second dimension and free choice as the third dimension.

In developing the rationale for these three dimensions, I find it necessary to first describe briefly a bilingual program for Indian or Eskimo children. After that I will attempt to make an inventory of the three current opinions about bilingual education.

I quote a revered author of many years experience in Indian education for the purpose of describing a bilingual program. Madison Coombs gives us a sample case. "Bilingual Education makes a great

contribution to the Indian child. Let us say that he is a Navajo in a school in which half of the teachers are Navajo speakers and half of them are English speakers. The Navajo teachers, during half of the day, present the entire curriculum through that language. The English-speaking teachers, using their own mother tongue, present the entire curriculum through that language during the second half of the day. Since the child understands Navajo perfectly, there is no mystery about the informational content that is going from teacher and book to pupil. The child learns English, but English is not being asked to carry a burden that it can't carry at that time. The main cause for the child's retardation in school is removed. He has complete access to everything through his own language."[5]

There are generally three camps of thought concerning the kind of education just described. The title I have given the first connotes my own personal estimate of it. I call this school of thought "Uncle Orski." It is a conglomerate of the opinions of "Uncle Sam' as seen in the years of official suppression of languages in the schools other than English, of George Orwell, in his description of the year 1984. . . . And of Dr. Charles Skinner.

A superintendent of BIA schools in 1896, questioned the educational validity of the government policy:

> . . . The great majority of Indian teachers have labored under the delusion that they can hasten the acquisition of the English language on the part of the pupils by compulsory measures, visiting more or less severe penalties upon the unfortunate children who were caught in the use of the Indian speech . . . To throw contempt upon the child's vernacular . . . is so manifestly unreasonable and so pernicious in its perverting and destructive influence upon the child's heart-life that it is a wonder that it even should have been attempted by the philanthropic fervor of workers in Indian schools.[6]

The U. S. Government's Indian educational policies were reflected in the following statistic: in the 1800s, the Cherokees had an educational system which produced a "population 90% literate in its native language and used bilingual materials to such an extent that Oklahoma Cherokees had a higher English literacy level than the white population of either Texas or Arkansas." Today "40% of adult Cherokee are functionally illiterate."[7]

In further description of the first school of thought about bilingualism (or even multilingualism), I quote, in part, the Appendix of 1984" by George Orwell: "Newspeak was the official language of Oceania and had been devised to meet the ideological needs of INGSOC, or English Socialism. In the year 1984 there was not as

yet anyone who used Newspeak as his sole means of communication, either in speech or writing. It was expected that Newspeak would have finally superseded Oldspeak (or Standard English as we call it) by about the year 2050. The word "free" still existed in Newspeak, but it could only be used in such statements as "This dog is free from lice." The puprose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of INGSOC, but to make all other modes of thought impossible.[6]

So much for the scarey and prophetic words of Orwell to indicate yet another group of thinkers in this camp which opposes bilingual education for Indians and others who do not grow up with the dominant idiom.

The other counterpart of the Uncle Orski school is the now much-discussed Dr. Charles Skinner. In his latest utopian thesis "Beyond Freedom and Dignity" he denies that a student should have the social choice of the means by which he shall communicate. All students would, as I understand Skinner's ideas, speak only the common language of all. And this so as to protect the rest of society from confusion.

The second school of thought is that of the fence sitters. They are linguists for the most part, and, in my obversation, linguists in Academia. Because they they do not have research data to prove conclusively that second language acquisition is best effected through competence in one's first language, they feel compelled to establish a dictum similar to the following: "In order to compete in the modern U.S.A. one must have competence in English. We haven't been able to achieve this with disadvantaged children yet, and the safest statement seems to be total immersion in English." The aforementioned Dr. Campbell fits this category if he is really serious about his statement.

Finally, there are those of us who believe in truly bilingual education for youngsters whose home language is Hopi, Tewa, Inupiaq, Cherokee, etc. We believe that introduction to formal schooling must be in the language learned from the cradle. We believe that statistics concerning the failure of disadvantaged children to meet national norms is due in great part to our failure to establish learning habits in their native language. We believe that the ideal teacher for these children is one who is not only a good teacher but also one who can speak both the children's home language and the Nation's dominant language. We believe that educational researchers have to get off the fence and help us to develop sound ESL principles and strategies because we believe that good ESL is the other side of the coin in bilingual education. Last but not least we believe that free choice

is a student right which children have who inherit a tribal or ethnic language other than English.

There is an unpretentious rule that works as well for Education as it does for progress in general. Stated plainly the rule says: Start where you are, take what you have, and make something out of it. If the results of Indian education have been by and large disappointing, if the "something" educators have tried to make out of Indian students has been consistently less than the "something" they have helped Anglo students to achieve, it is largely due to the fact that for any number of reasons, good, bad, or indifferent they did not start where the Indian student was nor did they build on what the Indian student already had. They all but totally ignored the rich heritage of language, culture, and wisdom that the Indian child brought with him to school.

"You have to start with the youngster where he is," educator-psychologist John Bryde told the Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education in December of 1967. "The Indian youngster is an Indian. You have to start with his Indian awareness and build on it. We have been starting with the Indian youngster where the non-Indian child is. We should be starting with him as an Indian child, teaching him values, and teaching him, first of all, to be an Indian. Then to be an Indian-American within the larger culture." Since this had not been the case, Bryde concluded, ". . . we have been making a pedagogical mistake. We have been making a psychological mistake. We have been making an anthropological mistake. We have been making all kinds of mistakes, according to the behavioral sciences."[1]

If the natural heritage of the American Indian has been overlooked by educators, so too has the original meaning of Education too often been forgotten. The word Education originally meant and still basically means the drawing out of a person's full human potential. Education is the nurturing of a seed, surrounding it with warmth and sunshine, tending it till it flowers and bears fruit. This is what Indian education, on the whole, has not done.

No one will deny the teacher's task of transferring information. Simple information transfer, however, is but one of the many means in providing a wholesome education and one of the less important means. Today's electronic data machines make the brightest human memory seem feeble indeed. On the other hand, it is beyond the grasp of machinery to feel the exhilaration of simple discovery or the delight of childhood wonder. Information may add rings to the tree of memory, but much more in the line of genuine education is needed to add the dimension of self-fulfillment to the human spirit. This is why bilingualism is such a promising development in Indian and Eskimo education. Educators are finally being encouraged to develop bilingual programs that start where the Indian pupil is, take what he already has, and offer him the choice to make out of it what wants.

Choice, then, is one of the key words in bilingual education. Not only is a child of a minority mother tongue offered a more sound education based on what he already is and has when he comes to school, and many early childhood psychologists today maintain that a child's IQ potential is largely determined before he ever goes to school, but he is given the genuine freedom to choose to what degree he wants to function in the mainstream of American society or remain in his own culture. Official Government policy is finally encouraging serious, long-term bilingual programs that will offer Indians the choice of success in the "American" way of life, the "Indian" way of life, or any combination of the two. Bicultural mobility through bilingual education has become a hopeful new policy in Indian education.

If Indian bilingual education, however, is to become more than a fad, experiment, or mere palliative; if it is to become a genuine and lasting success, it needs more than initial enthusiasm. There are many obstacles to be hurdled. A policy is not a program. A slogan is not success. The problems must be foreseen and forestalled so that the education of Indian children need not rise and fall with the whims of history. The first condition for a successful or even a useful bilingual program is the local community. Does the situation warrant a truly bilingual program and to what extent? Are there a sufficient number of children who speak only or mainly their vernacular when they come to school? Do the parents of the children want such a program? Will it be backed by the local community? Just as there is no such thing as "good English" but only good English in a particular situation, so too, there is no such thing as "preferred bilingualism," only bilingualism preferred in a particular situation.

If a child from a non-English-speaking home will profit more by receiving his basic school education in his own vernacular and provided there are enough such children to justify a bilingual school program in a given area, then any number of other factors must also be considered before a successful program can be set up. These include linguistic, political, educational, socio-cultural, economic, financial, and practical considerations. All of these must be carefully considered in developing any bilingual program.

In conclusion, my plea is for language freedom for students who speak a language other than English in this country. I have called this choice the third dimension of bilingual education. If I were making a plea that you teach every language to every student, then you would rightfully attack me for inhibiting the freedom of students. Then the caution of Alvin Toffler in "Future Shock" would be applicable. I would be promoting what he calls "overchoice."[10]. But I am not suggesting such a foolish tower of Babel for students. I am simply suggesting bilingual education for disadvantaged children when it is warranted. My plea is for free choice for these students. In other words, I say: let them march to the drum they choose.

[1] Campbell, Russell N. "Some Thoughts on Bilingual Education for Mexican-American Children in California." Workpapers Teaching English as a Second Language, Vol. V, June 1971, UCLA.

[2] Ibid, p. 21.

[3] BIA, Office of Education programs, "Bilingual Education for American Indians." Curriculum Bulletin No. 3, 1971, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

[4] Mackey, William F. *Bilingualism;* International Center for Research on Bilingualism. Quebec.

[5] BIA, Office of Education Programs. "Bilingual Education for American Indians." Curriculum Bulletin No. 3, 1971, p. 13.

[6] Hailman, H. N., Supt. of Indian Schools Ann. Rep. 8 (1898).

[7] Indian Education 19.

[8] Orwell, George. "1984," The New American Library 1949, Appendix.

[9] Bryde, John, in special subcommittee report on Indian education, Dec. 1967, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

[10] Toffler, Alvin. *Future Shock.* Random House Books, Chapters 12 and 13.

Who's to Say: Controversies Over What Linguistics Can and Cannot Say About Nonstandard Dialects

Walt Wolfram
Federal City College and
Center for Applied Linguistics

Relatively early in my career as a linguist, I can recall being asked to address an audience of reading specialists on some fundamental notions in linguistics. During the ensuing discussion of the lecture, there was considerable discussion of THE linguistic approach to reading. I must confess that I was puzzled. I was the linguist asked to address the audience and I didn't know what the linguistic approach to reading was. I thought that I had sufficient course work as a graduate student to insure against such an obvious deficit, but I was left dumfounded. Furthermore, I had studied some aspects of applied linguistics, learned all the alternatives for teaching reading, and taught literacy myself, but it was to no avail in aiding my understanding. So I nodded my head sympathetically, assiduously avoided any comment which might expose my ignorance, and concluded the session without sufficient loss of prestige. Considerable time has elapsed since that episode, and I have now become more accustomed to jargon outside of my own narrow specialties. More importantly, perhaps, I have come to the point where I feel no need to cover up for my ignorance. And, I must confess that I still do not know what THE linguistic approach to reading is.

Since the emergence of the discipline of linguistics as a "scientific" study of language in the United States, there has always been an applied aspect of the field. These aspects have been of concern for a number of years, and they continue to be fertile areas for the application of the science of linguistics. More recently, and particularly within the last decade, we have begun to witness the application of linguistics to the area of social dialects under the rubric sociolinguistics. Those linguists (socio- and psycho-linguists) who have shown a descriptive concern for the study of so-called nonstandard dialects have usually been concerned with some of the social issues associated with speakers of nonstandard dialects (whether black, Chicano, or poor white) so that they have attempted to make their linguistic analysis have some practical import. For this practical concern, they can be applauded. But in an effort to apply some of the insight gained from the field of linguistics to educational concerns, some confusion has arisen over what conclusions linguists find

invariably linked to their discipline and what conclusions are not. This paper is presented in an effort to clarify some of the issues concerning the application of linguistics to the study of nonstandard dialects.

Certainly, linguists, either individually or collectively, have a right to have views on any social issue in which they might be interested. I therefore defend my right to take whatever position I feel to be morally right on civil rights, the war in Vietnam, religion, the economy, and so forth. I further have a right to take any position I see appropriate with regard to the educational system for minority and majority group children, teaching standard English, and teaching nonstandard speaking children to read. What we must be careful to distinguish, however, is the difference between a position which is invariably tied to the science of the study of language and one which has no inherent relation to what a linguist may know about the structure of language. To reiterate, then, the question is what particular viewpoints necessarily follow from the view of language inherent to the discipline of linguistics and what viewpoints current in applied sociolinguistics do not.

Let me begin on a positive note, by citing some viewpoints on nonstandard dialects which follow from the systematic study of language which is characteristic of linguistics. Linguists present a united front when they declare that all language systems provide for the conceptualization and expression of logical propositions which underlie the use of language to express syllogistic reasoning. We maintain that fundamental logical operations such as adjunctions, deduction, negation, conjunction, and the like are provided for by any language or dialect, regardless of its social status or role. The particular mode (i.e., grammar) for conceptualizing these underlying propositions which lie at the basis of syllogistic reasoning may differ drastically from language to language or from dialect to dialect, but there is nothing inherent in a given language variety which will interfere with the development of conceptualization. Linguistically speaking, there are no illogical language varieties, and hence no languages or dialects which impose cognitive deficits. Despite impressive sounding dictums about the illogical nature of some language varieties by persons who ethnocentrically confuse social acceptability with logic, there is no evidence for this position. For example, languages (e.g., Spanish or French) and dialects (nonstandard white and black speech) that use double negatives to indicate one underlying negative statement are every bit as logical as languages or dialects which only indicate one negative for similar constructions (e.g., *He didn't do nothing, He didn't do anything*). Linguists stand united against popular misconceptions about the so-called illogic and cognitive limitations of nonstandard dialects such Black English, Appalachian white speech, and working class New York speech. Whatever cognitive limitations working class children may or may not have when compared with middle-class children on middle-class oriented tests, the

limitations cannot be related to cognitive limitations imposed by their language. Any field of academic endeavor (e.g., the premises which are at the basis of the Bereiter Englemann view of the language of the so-called disadvantaged) which flies in the face of this position had better prepare for a heated attack from linguists.

Linguists are further united in their insistence that all languages and dialects are adequate as communicative systems. It is accepted among linguists that language is a human phenomenon which characterizes every social group, and that all language systems are perfectly adequate as communicative systems for the members of the social group. The social acceptability of a particular language variety due to the social position of the people who speak this variety is totally unrelated to its adequacy as a communicative code. For the linguist, the question is not *what* can be said but *how* any language variety may choose to say something.

Anyone who looks closely at language cannot help but be impressed with the systematic and ordered nature of all language varieties. What, at first glance, may appear to be a maze of confusion in terms of sounds and words, turns out, on closer inspection, to be a highly detailed and structured set of patterns. Languages are not thrown together in a haphazard fashion, but reveal an internal coherence that makes the organization schemata of a computer look retarded by comparison. Subjective impressions of random structuring turn out to be a function of our inadequate or preconceived perceptions rather than empirically based fact. This can easily be illustrated by taking the case of final sounds in some nonstandard dialects, including Black English and some varieties of Appalachian white speech. Impressions abound concerning the fact that these dialects "leave things off at the end of the words, anywhere and anytime" (c.f. Shuy 1970 for documentation of these types of subjective impressions). But when these characteristics are subjected to the close scrutiny of analysis, we find out that the impressions cannot be justified. That there are certain types of word-final sounds in standard English which have no correspondence in some nonstandard dialects is an accurate observation. This correspondence, however, is systematic and ordered rather than random and haphazard. Thus, the final member of certain types of word-final blends or clusters in standard English are absent in Black English. But this is not characteristic of all blends. The types of blends affected follow a fairly intricate pattern in which both of the members of the cluster are either voiced or voiceless (e.g., *wes'*, *han'*, *buil'*, etc.) Blends in which one of the members is voiced and the other voiceless are not affected, so that items like *jump*, *belt*, *junk*, etc., do not "reduce." The failure to observe this patterned behavior is a function of our perception, not empirical fact concerning the structure of Black English.

At this point, let me interject that while all linguists agree that language reveals great organization and systematicity, there is some

disagreement among linguists themselves over what a linguist is doing when he gives a description of a language system. This dichotomy has sometimes been referred to as "God's truth" versus "hocus pocus" descriptions. The God's truth assumption is that a language variety has a structure that is there waiting to be analyzed and that any failure to arrive at an accurate description is a result of insufficient or faulty procedure; there is only one "correct" solution. On the other hand, the hocus pocus position assumes that there may be different ways of correctly analyzing the same data and that one solution may be just as adequate as another. The outsider should not be deceived by this disagreement over how to represent a linguistic description, for whether one takes a God's truth or hocus-pocus stance on the description of facts, linguists are united in their insistence on the basic systematic nature of language. To illustrate, there are a number of differene descriptions over the grammatical function of *be* used as a finite form in Black English (e.g., *Sometime he be busy and sometime he don't*) and linguists may argue quite polemically among themselves in defense of a particular analysis. But this polemic about the grammatical function should not be misinterpreted to mean that this use of *be* is simply an unworthy approximation of standard English with no real systematicity. To say this would unite all linguists who may differ in their grammatical analysis in defense of this feature as a patterned and structured grammatical characteristic.

That linguists are impressed with the organization of language does not, of course, mean that they are in agreement over how to represent the different organizational levels of language. For example, linguists who have taken their impetus from the work of Chomsky and the development of transformational-generative grammar, insist that it is crucial to differentiate between the "deep" (the level at which the propositional elements of syntax are represented) and "surface" structure (the form in which the sentence actually appears) and that those levels are related by transformational rules. Other linguists, following a tradition established by Bloomfield (1933) in the United States, have insisted that a linguist's task is restricted to categorizing the corpus of observed utterances without reference to different fundamental levels of grammar (i.e., only the surface structure is described). Anyone who has wet his hands in linguistics in even an elementary way is aware that the polemic over this issue matches the polemic in any field of scientific endeavor.

Furthermore, linguists are not even together over the question of how language is acquired. Some linguists take the view, following Chomsky (1965) and Lenneberg (1967) that humans have an innate capacity to search for abstract grammatical rules from sentences which are generated, while others, following Skinner (1957) maintain that language acquisition is purely the result of behavioristic conditioning. And, I report again, the polemic does not usually result in compromise. But do not be deceived by this controversy, for

whatever one's position on the mentalism/behavioralism question is, the conclusions about the communicative adequacy of all language varieties match. In the one case, the mentalistic viewpoint, the adequacy of all language systems results on the basis of a "universal grammar" (i.e., a putative attribute of being human), whereas from the behavioralist viewpoint, it is claimed on the basis of cross-cultural comparison (i.e., a survey of representative language samples reveals all of them to be adequate communicative codes). Furthermore, both positions would unite in maintaining that the rate of language acquisition tends to be parallel from language to language; the nonstandard-speaking child acquires his nonstandard dialect at approximately the same rate as the standard English speaking child. Now if a nonstandard speaking child is measured in terms of standard norms, he may appear to be linguistically retarded in language development, but this is a function of the application of inappropriate, external norms rather than actual language retardation.

It is crucial for nonlinguists to understand that although linguists have as many, if not more, controversial issues than any modern scientific discipline, there are some fundamental notions which inherently unite them. I therefore speak confidently that linguists as a group will unanimously oppose any viewpoint of nonstandard dialects which repudiates the essential patterned and structured nature of these socially stigmatized varieties.

So much for what linguists CAN say. Now let us move to the grayer areas. These areas particularly related to applied educational concerns such as the teaching of standard English, teaching reading to nonstandard English speakers, and testing.

Teaching Standard English

To begin with, there is no such thing as a linguistic position on teaching standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects. Whatever position a linguist may take on this issue is a function of how he views the realities of linguistic prejudice (which, of course, reflect class and race prejudice) in American society and not from any position inherent in linguistics. There are some linguists, such as Kochman (1970) and Sledd (1970), who do not feel that standard English should be taught, but their reasons are socio-political and not linguistic. Sledd, for example, sees teaching standard English as a social contradiction, and that we should focus our attention on teaching tolerance for linguistic diversity. Kochman reveals the same type of argument, but further cites the difficulties in defining a standard English norm and the lack of success in actually teaching standard English. More recently, Fasold (1971) has joined this camp because:

> To a large degree, what the English teacher does in the classroom with regard to spoken standard English is irrelevant.

> Speakers who start out speaking nonstandard English but find they need to learn standard English will learn it, and those who do not will not, almost independently of what their English teachers do. (1971:86)

On the other hand, there are linguists who take the same fundamental view of language common to Sledd, Kochman, and Fasold, but maintain that teaching standard English is consonant with the existent social structure of American society. Thus, Hoffman (1971) has a strong refutation of Sledd and Kochman's position as inefficient, impractical, and itself discriminatory. Furthermore, anthologies such as *Linguistic-Cultural Differences and American Education* (1969) and *Teaching Standard English in the Inner City* (1970) contain articles endorsing a position of bidialectism (i.e., standard English is an additive dialect to be used in certain social situations instead of a replacive dialect which eradicates the indigenous dialect). Linguists such as Shuy (1970), Stewart (1970) and Hoffman (1971) among others, have taken this position.

It is a little more difficult to find linguists who, at least in print, will subscribe to a position which theoretically calls for the eradication of nonstandard dialects in favor of standard English. In a sense, this follows a linguistic tradition which attempts to preserve distinct language varieties because of a common reverence for the systematic and patterned nature of each language variety. From a linguist's point of view, a call for the eradication of some indigenous language varieties makes as much sense as a zoologist calling for the extinction of a particular species. Although it may be theoretically possible (and I have heard of linguists who in private have hinted at this position), it is a rather unlikely occurrence.

I personally think that standard English should only be taught as an optional subject at a point in a child's education where he has become sufficiently aware of the social stigma that may be attached to speaking a nonstandard dialect. No child should be coerced to study standard English. My reason for this position has little to do with the profession of linguistics; it is based on my perception of linguistic prejudice in American society, the role of the school, and what I think concerning the expediency of conforming to white middle-class norms. The essential thing to note in my own position is that it is motivated for reasons which are essentially outside the scope of linguistics.

Just as there is no linguistic position on whether standard English should or should not be taught, I must put in a disclaimer concerning the notion that there is a linguistic *method* for teaching standard English. To be sure, there are some materials which conform more closely to the linguistic facts of the source (the nonstandard dialect) and target (standard English) dialects than others, but these are matters of fundamental accuracy, not methodology. There are a num-

ber of techniques which might be used in teaching standard English, but none of them is inherently more linguistic than the other. It is possible to use TESL techniques or materials which build on the notion that nonstandard and standard dialects of English are very closely related, and each of these might be used with equal insight into the linguistic structure of the source and target language.

On the other hand, the use of materials based on the assumption that a nonstandard English speaker's language is inadequate for communication or imposes cognitive limitations would be suspect because of the linguist's regard for the adequacy of all language systems as communicative codes. The methods themselves might be quite creative, and provide for some desired results, but the assumption that standard English will add cognitive skills to a deficient language system may result in a focus on skills which have nothing to do with the linguistic structure of the source and target language. I personally consider the *Distar* materials developed by Bereiter and Engelmann to be such a case. Some of the methodological techniques in lesson material are quite ingenious, but the assumption that nonstandard English imposes certain cognitive limitations results in a focus on certain standard English forms without recognizing (or building on) the equivalent nonstandard forms which are an integral part of the child's dialect.

Teaching Reading to Nonstandard Speakers

The field of reading has probably been more susceptible to the misnomer of a linguistic approach than that of teaching standard English. I am well aware that THE linguistic method for teaching reading has a captivating appeal analogous to "the new math." And, if a publisher wants to sell books and a school system wants to be innovative, the appeal can have considerable effect. But what does it mean to use the linguistic approach to reading? Does it mean that one method for teaching reading will result in more efficient reading skills than another if it is linguistic? And, if it does not, what difference does it make whether it's the linguistic, psychological, or Ouija board approach to reading? There are a number of different methods which might be used in teaching reading, including so-called phonics, combined phonics-syllable, word attack skills, and a context approach in which one starts from the sentence. In reality, of course, many of these methods are combined, and different skills are probably more appropriate at different stages of reading (c.f. Shuy 1969:126). All of these approaches have strong proponents and opponents, and various studies purport to demonstrate the effectiveness of one or the other of these methods. As far as I know, however, no clear-cut winner has emerged.

Now it is true that some of these methods may align themselves with the linguistic facts about English more adequately than others, but none of these approaches is necessarily linguistic. Wardaugh notes:

> Although it is possible to make various proposals for using the findings of linguistic research in the teaching of reading, *These proposals by no means add up to a method of teaching reading.* An adequate method of teaching reading must draw on insights from many other disciplines in addition to linguistics. Linquists are but one group which may have a legitimate interest in the teaching of reading. (1969:14-15)

Shuy also notes:

> One of the first and most important things that a reading teacher should learn about linguistics is that there is no such thing as *the* linguistic method or approach to reading. . . . Linguistics is not the easy cure-all to the reader's difficulties. . . . But linguists, as scholars in the field of language, do have some things to say which can be very useful for the teaching of reading . . . (1969:8)

What linguists are saying is that they do not have a panacean approach to teaching reading. On the other hand, a discipline which deals with language in a structured way will have insight into the nature of language which can be utilized by the reading teacher. Wardaugh (1969:60-62) lists some of these insights as follows:

1. The linguist can offer some account of the linguistic competence shared by mature speakers of the language.

2. The linguist can offer characterizations of the linguistic competence of children at different stages in their language development.

3. In his competence model the linguist can offer descriptions of the sentences of English.

4. The linguist can offer an account of the systematic way in which symbols are used to represent linguistic structures.

5. The linguist can offer some help in explaining the semantic structures that exist in English.

6. The linguist can offer descriptions of dialect variations; he can demonstrate the relationship of a particular spoken dialect to a standard written language.

Even if we assume that Wardhaugh claims are exaggerated in terms of the importance he ascribes to linguistic insight, none of these areas of expertise leads to a linguistic method as such. It is possible to use practically any of the current methodologies with or without the application of linguistic insight. Unfortunately, however, the pub-

lishing domain has played somewhat of an advertising hoax on the educational public.

As with other areas of linguistic expertise we have discussed, it should not be assumed that linguists are in complete agreement concerning the specific organization of language as it relates to reading. For example, the "phonics" approach may focus on the fundamental relationship between the systematic relationships of sounds to letters and the subsequent programming of these correspondences in beginning reading texts. But linguists are not at all agreed on the level of sound relationships to which graphemes are to be related. It has often been suggested that graphemes should be related to phonemes. But this relationship has been called into question by some linguists who maintain that the most efficient and psychologically real relationship should exist between graphemes and a more abstract level of the sound system (cf. Fasold 1969), that is, the morphophoneme. In the latter case, the graphemes may be different from the actual phoneme, whereas in the former case an isomorphic relationship between phonemes and graphemes is called for. In both cases, the relationships may be based on linguistic structure, but the fundamental units in that structure may vary according to interpretation, which, in turn, may alter the graphemic representation of the language. This disagreement over which system to use does not, however, mean that linguists will not insist that orthography be a systematic representation of structural units in a language; I know of no linguist who would take this position.

In the preceding list of linguistic contributions cited from Wardhaugh it is noted that one of the areas of linguistic expertise from which reading teachers stand to profit is that of dialect variations. Linguists who study nonstandard dialect are in a position to say how the phonological and grammatical structure of a given nonstandard dialect relate to reading materials which might potentially be used by these speakers. And, as might be suspected, there is more distance between Black English and current reading materials than there is between standard English and the same materials. This, however, tends to be a matter of quantity rather than quality, since most reading materials also involve structures which are not normally used in spoken standard English. Looking at the degree of difference may lead to different conclusions concerning this distance. Some scholars, such as Baratz (1969) and Stewart (1969), have come to the conclusion that the distance between Black English and current materials is sufficiently great to warrant dialect readers. Others, such as Shuy (1969), have suggested that we need to "neutralize" current materials by eliminating characteristics not found in nonstandard dialects from the materials. Still others, such as Goodman (1969), have maintained that the materials be kept as they are, but that children should be allowed, even encouraged, to give appropriate dialect renderings of passages. And finally, it has been suggested (e.g. Bailey 1971) that standard English be taught prior to reading, then

standard English materials can safely be given to all speakers. Not one of these alternatives, however, is *the* linguistic answer. The basic question on which linguists disagree is how far removed from actual speech reading materials must be to make a significant difference.

It is interesting to note that some of the strongest reasons for advancing a particular alternative for teaching reading to nonstandard speakers given by advocates of these positions are social or psychological and not linguistic. Thus, for example, one of the reasons Goodman opts against dialect readers is the potential community reaction to such a proposal; Baratz, on the other hand, talks about the ego-support that children may potentially derive from using dialect readers.

I personally think that the linguistic aspects of the reading problem have been overemphasized by linguists to the exclusion of important social constraints which operate to encourage or discourage the acquisition of reading skills. And, I must plead *mea culpa*. This is not to say that there are no linguistic differences; there are differences in the standard English language represented in beginning reading materials and the dialect that a nonstandard speaking child brings to school with him. But I have still not been able, from a linguistic perspective, to deal with Fishman's question concerning reading and dialectally divergent speakers in his review of *Teaching Black Children to Read*. He cites examples of widespread literacy in countries where standard materials are used for speakers who speak dialects which are probably more linguistically divergent from the language of the readers than standard English is from Black English.

> . . . if the distance or difference between the vernacular and the school variety is truly so central in causing reading difficulties, then how do we explain the widespread literacy not only in the same population, but also among rural Japanese and Germans and Frenchmen and Swedes and Swiss-Germans and many others during the past quarter century and more? (1969:1109)

Studies such as Labov and Robin's (1965), of the relation of peer group involvement and reading failure for adolescent males in Harlem tend to point to a value conflict more than a linguistic conflict as the basis of reading difficulty. This is not to say that a linguist has nothing to say about the linguistic structure of reading materials and that nothing should be done about these differences, since I concur with Goodman (1969:13) that "the more divergence there is between the dialect of the learner and the dialect of learning, the more difficult will be the task of learning to read." Linguists do have a contribution to make, but if we wait for a panacean solution from linguists, the reading problem for nonstandard speakers may persist for a long time to come. Their contribution must be made with the educational specialist who has expertise in teaching methodology, the

psychologist who deals with reading and the individual personality, and the anthropologist or sociologist who can give us information on reading and group values.

Linguistics and Language Testing

What can a linguist say about language tests as they relate to non-standard dialect speakers? Again, his insight derives from his knowledge of the structural characteristics of nonstandard dialects, either in terms of their grammar or phonology. There are basically two areas where his structural insight may be of benifit: (1) the interpretation of test results as they relate to the structure of nonstandard dialects and (2) the construction of tests as they relate to linguistic characteristics of nonstandard dialects. In actuality, of course, these two aspects are interwoven in the quest for test validity. To the linguist, it is fairly obvious that there has been considerable misinterpretation of testing results for nonstandard speakers because standard English norms are the basis of comparison. Statements like the following look quite suspicious to linguists:

> By the time they are five years old, disadvantaged children of almost every kind are typically one or two years retarded in language development. This is supported by virtually any index of language one cares to look at. (Bereiter 1965:196)

Investigation of this claim reveals that the fact that these children do not speak standard English is taken to mean that they are linguistically retarded. Thus, if a black lower class child says *He nice*, a correspondent of standard English He's nice, it is considered to be an underdeveloped standard English approximation and equivalent to the absence of copula at a particular stage of standard English acquisition. The fact that adult speakers may use this form is irrelevent, only meaning that adults may have some stabilized form of language retardation. The linguist, however, suggests that Black English is simply one of many languages and dialects, including Russian, which have a zero copula realization in the present tense.

Similarly, auditory discrimination tests which are designed on a standard English norm are *de facto* biased against a nonstandard English system. For example, in the auditory discrimination test developed by Wepman, the failure to distinguish *wreath* from *reef* or *lave* from *lathe* are considered to be indicative of underdeveloped auditory discrimination since these words are contrastive in standard English. But we observe that such pairs are the result of a systematic pattern in which *th* and *f* are not distinguished at the end of a word in Black English. Homophony is a widespread and common language phenomenon, and the above homophonous words should cause us no more concern than the homophony of *red* (the color) and *read* (the past tense of *read*) or *roll* (the edible object) and *role* (relating to social behavior). What we observe, then, is that the Black English speaker

is penalized for the patterned homophony of his dialect, whereas a middle class New Englander is not penalized for the homophony of *caught* (the past tense of *catch*) and *cot* (the object for resting) or *taught* (the past tense of *teach*) and *torte* (the pastry). The learning of standard English must be clearly differentiated from the learning of an indigenous dialect which is considered socially unacceptable.

I once asked a group of New England speech therapists what they did when they had to evaluate the articulation of post-vocalic *r* in *car* for a middle-class New England child since it was an item which one of the standardized articulation tests called for. Without hesitation, I was told, "We realize that he's from New England and don't hold it against him." Unfortunately, many evaluators are victims of a double standard, in which the nonstandard speaking child is penalized for speaking a socially stigmatized variety while the speaker of a New English "r-less" dialect is not penalized because he speaks a non-stigmatized variety.

When we compare the linguistic structure of nonstandard dialects with the linguistic features which are tested in many language oriented tests, we find that a definite linguistic bias is found. That is, the tests lack validity because they do not test what they are supposed to test. For example, the language section in the California Achievement Test is designed "for the measurement, evaluation, and diagnosis of school achievement" (California Achievement Test 1963:2). In reality, what some of the exercises deal with is the ability to distinguish between standard and nonstandard English sentences. Thus, a child is supposed to choose correct responses for items like:

I have read those books before
(them)

I didn't hear no noise
(any)

Now these items may be an adequate diagnostic test for a child's acquisition of standard English, but they do not necessarily measure school acievement with respect to language. For the standard-English-speaking child, it only measures what he already comes to school with, but for a nonstandard speaking child, it measures whether or not he has acquired standard English. A nonstandard speaking child who can give several standard English responses on such a test may have made more school achievement than a standard English speaking child who makes a high score because he came to school using standard English.

Because of an almost uniform bias of current language testing, some language specialists have called for a testing moratorium until valid tests can be constructed. These must be constructed on the basis of a linguistic knowledge of the features of the various nonstandard dialects and standard English, which current construction

and interpretation of tests have not taken into account. Unless we rescore current tests for nonstandard speakers (eliminating features which are different in the nonstandard dialect) or develop new, appropriate tests, I personally endorse this moratorium.

This is not to say that the linguist has the answer to our testing problems because he may have a knowledge of the linguistic structures involved. There are, of course, many other areas of expertise in test construction such as reliability, testing procedures, sampling, and the like. Together with specialists in the various aspects of testing, it may be possible to develop valid tests which can be used for nonstandard dialect speakers, or to suggest rescoring of current tests. The linguistic contribution is but one of the areas of need for an eventual end to many of the invalid language tests which are biased against nonstandard speakers.

Conclusion

In accordance with varying expectations, one may conclude that I am overly optimistic or pessimistic concerning the implications that linguistics has for the education of nonstandard dialect speakers. I have, however, neither attempted to exaggerate nor overemphasize the contributions that linguistic expertise has to this area. I personally am convinced that linguistics has some essential contributions to make to many educational areas which deal with nonstandard dialects. Perhaps most basic to the scientific contributions that this discipline can make is its contribution in terms of language attitudes. The attitudinal problem towards intricate and unique nonstandard dialects spoken in American society is probably the biggest problem we face. And, in this regard, I must reiterate that anyone who looks closely at the various nonstandard dialects in terms of their detailed structure and organization, cannot help but come away with a nonpaternalistic respect for language, in all its varieties, as a uniquely human phenomenon.

REFERENCES

Bailey, Beryl L. "Some Arguments Against the Use of Dialect Readers in the Teaching of Initial Reading," *The Florida FL Reporter*, Vol. 8, No. 1 and 2, Spring/Fall, 1970.

Baratz, Joan C. "Teaching Reading in an Urban Negro School System," in Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy, (eds.) *Teaching Black Children to Read*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Bereiter, Carl. "Academic Instruction and Preschool Children," in Richard Corbin and Muriel Crosby (eds.), *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged*. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

Bereiter, Carl and Seigfried Englemann. *Teaching Disadvantaged Children in Preschool*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language*. New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1933.

California Achievement Tests, 1963.

Chomsky, Noam. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1965.

Fasold, Ralph W. "Orthography in Reading Materials for Black English Speaking Children," in Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy (eds.), *Teaching Black Children to Read*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Fasold, Ralph W. "What Can an English Teacher Do About Non-standard Dialect?" in Rudolfo Jacobson (ed.), *Studies in English to Speakers of Other Languages and Standard English to Speakers of Non-Standard Dialect*, Special Anthology Issue and Monograph 14 of *The English Record*, 1971.

Fishman, Joshua A. "Literacy and the Language Barrier," Book Review of *Intelligence and Cultural Environment* by Philip E. Vernon, and *Teaching Black Children to Read*, by Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy (eds.), *Science* 165:1108-1109, 1969.

Goodman, Kenneth S. "Dialect Barriers to Reading Comprehension," in Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy (eds.), *Teaching Black Children to Read*, Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Hoffman, Melvin J. "Bidialection is Not the Linguistics of White Supremacy," in Rudolfo Jacobson (ed.), *Studies in English to Speakers of Other Languages and Standard English to Speakers of a Non-Standard Dialect*, Special Anthology Issue and Monograph 14 of *The English Record*, 1971.

Kochman, Thomas. "Social Factors in the Consideration of Teaching Standard English," in Alfred C. Aarons, Barbara Y. Gordon and William A. Stewart, *Linguistic-Cultural Differences and American Education*, Special Anthology Issue of *The Florida FL. Reporter*, 1969.

Labov, William and Clarence Robbins. "A Note on the Relation of Reading Failure to Peer-Group Status in Urban Ghettos," in Alfred C. Aarons, Barbara Y. Gordon and William A. Stewart (eds.) *Linguistic-Cultural Differences and American Education*, Special Anthology Issue of *The Florida FL. Reporter*, 1969

Lenneberg, Eric H. *Biological Foundations of Language*. New York, New York: Wiley, 1967.

Shuy, Roger W. Preface to *A Duck is a Duck*, Teachers' Edition. Boston, Massachusetts, 1969.

Shuy, Roger W. "A Linguistic Background for Developing Beginning Reading Materials for Black Children," in Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy (eds.), *Teaching Black Children to Read*, Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Shuy, Roger W. "Teacher Training and Urban Language Problems," in Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy (eds.), *Teaching Standard English in the Inner City*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

Skinner, B. F. *Verbal Behavior*. New York, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Sledd, James. "BiDialectism: The Linguistics of White Supremacy," *English Journal*, Vol. 58, No. 9, 1969.

Stewart, William A. "The Use of Negro Dialect in the Teaching of Reading," in Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy (eds.) *Teaching Black Children to Read*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. *Reading: A Linguistic Perspective*. New York, New York: Harcourt, Brace S. World, 1969.

Summary of the Conference: Practical Applications

Lorraine A. Strasheim

In the 1971 SCOLT Conference we have approached "A World Without Walls" in an effort to take down some walls and to make more openings in others.

Howard Altman stressed the need for a logical, systematic approach in his presentation, "Practical Aspects of Individualizing Foreign Language Instruction." He urged us to let the shape and dimensions of our endeavors in this area vary according to the needs and resources of our own situations. He told us that the two most important facets of individualized instruction were that the student always knows the nature of his learning task and that the teacher becomes a manager and facilitator of the learning process.

Professor Jeanne Varney Pleasants, in "Teaching Language Through Literature," described a means of teaching language through literature, urging us to investigate issues and seek insights in our teaching. She reminded us that hard work is not necessarily boring work, using poetry to illustrate phonemic contrasts, grammar facets, and lexicon. With Professor Pleasants' presentation, we also learned, unfortunately, that some of us are still wall building. We heard things like, "Why weren't there examples in *my* language?" and "I don't understand French." We forgot to communicate in the one language we have in common here, sacrificing the broader goals to "my language."

The work sessions drawing the largest number of participants were those on individualized instruction, flexible scheduling, and the black student. In the one on flexible scheduling we erred; we had believed that there were enough people involved in or informed about flexible scheduling to make a question-answer format workable. An information-dispensing session would have been more valuable.

The session on English for the Disadvantaged centered its attention on spotting and coping with learning disabilities. This topic would be well expanded for general sessions at future Conferences. In the work session on the language laboratory we learned that the problems of four or five years ago are still with us. Labs are deteriorating or locked up, although student placement in oral skills is lower than it was a few short years ago. We apparently need some

concentrated effort on skillful and meaningful laboratory use and adaptation. In the work sessions, too, we noticed that far more people are interested in supervision of the high-school teacher than in college TA supervision. Some attention is being directed toward overt and deliberate effort to prepare our college teachers, but the movement is a slow one. In the session on the Georgia TV FLES Program, we came to grips with the use of the medium to the fullest—as a truly expanded environment.

We seem to have revealed more interest during the Conference in what we are *going to do* than *with whom*. There is a need for all foreign-language specialists to become more "plugged into" the various types of disadvantaged students, bilingualism, and English as a second language. If these are not walls, they are at least "compartments" which need to be opened up. Interestingly enough, despite our Conference theme, there were few mentions of interdisciplinary approaches like those in Gary, Indiana or Commack, New York. We did hear brief allusions to Martha McClure's social studies and foreign language project.

There are three types of conference participants. The first of these I call the conference "drop in." This person "drops in" on conferences as he does on any social occasion, a tea, a reception, or a party; he does not go with any idea of learning or being changed, but rather just to socialize. The second of these three types is the conference "drop out." He comes to the conference and registers but "drops out" of all sessions for the bar and the exhibit area; he knows what the program says, not what was said during the program. The last of the three conference "types" is the only one who is a participant in any real sense. This person comes to be a panelist, to ask questions, to contribute ideas, to learn. He is the only one who wants to change and who may change.

This last type of person is the one who has determined during the Conference what topics he needs to learn more about. He will be reading the *Modern Language Journal*, *FL Annals*, and the AAT journals in his search. He will press the editors for information he needs, he will make known his wishes to textbook publishers and state organizations. He may even use departmental meetings for sharing knowledge instead of bookkeeping functions.

And he will not overlook the letter. He will write to program participants with his questions. Write to Howard Altman; he does an excellent job with correspondence. Write to anyone who may be able to help you.

And if you need spiritual uplift, and I often think that what we really need is a foreign language *Up the Down Staircase*, read the romantic educators. Read Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner's *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, read George B. Leonard's *Edu-*

cation and Ecstacy, read Charles B. Silberman's *Crisis in Education*. You won't like it all, but most of it will give you renewed vigor in your self-appointed tasks.

If you are waiting for "packages," waiting to make changes until you have the new building, the ideal materials, and the like, there will be no changes. That is rather like waiting to get married until you can *really* afford it. If you are willing to change now, the alternatives are infinite: they include individualization, interdisciplinary programs, exploratory efforts, language through literature approaches, non-literature alternatives (my own favorite in this category is American History in French with its potential for expanding personal horizons and perspectives), mini-courses, and the idea *you* are going to have. Just keep in mind that the "new" teacher is a manager or facilitator of learning, a co-learner, and a determiner of learning success (read *Pygmalion in the Classroom* in this context).

Learn how to break down walls. Take chairs out of rows and sit in a circle, get students to talk to one another—break down the unidirectional "talk" of the classroom, take a non-foreign-language colleague to lunch and listen to him talk about his program, ask some questions (in and out of class) to which you do not already know the answers.

Here's a process for application of the Conference, utilizing Howard Altman's suggestions.

1. Determine the topic you are *most* interested in.
2. Develop a bibliography. (*FL Annals* is excellent for this.)
3. Read at least 3 articles.
4. Develop a concrete mini-sample.
5. "Touch base" by getting a colleague to react to your sample. (Here's another time for letters. This will also serve to obligate or commit you to the task at hand. Write to Howard!)
6. Use the sample as a self-test in your teaching.
7. Evaluate.

Minimum participation is all of the above.

The finest language student I know was a boy who was never collegebound but who studied Spanish with enthusiasm, finally participating in a summer study program in Mexico. Later, when he was asked what possible good all his Spanish had done him, he said something like, "Living with my family in Mexico taught me a way

of dealing with my children my father never knew." To my mind, this boy received the greatest possible benefit from his foreign-language study. He already lives in "a world without walls."

Walls are a state of mind. With all the rapid, intensive, and kaleidoscopic changes taking place in the world today, *can't we change our minds?*

PATRONS and SPONSORS
1971 SOUTHERN CONFERENCE ON LANGUAGE TEACHING

Upon payment of $50 or more, an educational institution or organization becomes a Patron of the Conference with the privilege of naming two voting representatives to the Advisory Board. Upon payment of $25, the institution becomes a Sponsor of the Conference with one voting representative on the Advisory Board. The registration fee of official representatives in included in the Patron's or Sponsor's contribution.

Institutions whose Patron or Sponsor payment was received after the program went to press will be added to this list in the 1971 Proceedings to be published after the Conference.

Patrons are indicated by an asterisk.

Agnes Scott College	Decatur, Ga.
Alabama State Department of Education	Montgomery, Ala.
Alamo Valley Chapter of AATSP	San Antonio, Tex.
American Association of Teachers of German	Philadelphia, Pa.
Armstrong State College	Savannah, Ga.
*Association of Foreign Language Teachers, SCEA	Columbia, S. C.
Atlanta University	Atlanta, Ga.
Belmont Abbey College	Belmont, N. C.
Brevard College	Brevard, N. C.
Christopher Newport College of the College of William and Mary	Newport News, Va.
Claflin College	Orangeburg, S. C.
Clark College	Atlanta, Ga.
*Clemson University	Clemson, S. C
Columbia Public Schools	Columbia, S. C.
*Converse College	Spartanburg, S. C.
*East Texas State University	Commerce, Tex.
Emory College, Emory University	Atlanta, Ga.
Fisk University	Nashville, Tenn.
*Florida A & M University	Tallahassee, Fla.
*Florida F L Reporter	No. Miami Beach, Fla.
*Florida Presbyterian College	St. Petersburg, Fla.
Florida State University	Tallahassee, Fla.
Foreign Language Association of Georgia	Griffin, Ga.
*Foreign Language Education Center, University of Texas—Austin	Austin, Tex.
Fulton County School System	Atlanta, Ga.
*Gaston College	Dallas, N. C.
Georgia Chapter, A A T G	Atlanta, Ga.
*Georgia Chapter, A A T S P	College Park, Ga.
Georgia State University	Atlanta, Ga.
Grissom High School	Huntsville, Ala.
Irving Public Schools	Irving, Tex.
Jacksonville University	Jacksonville, Fla.
*Johnson C. Smith University	Charlotte, N. C.
Lander College	Greenwood, S. C.
*Louisiana State University in New Orleans	New Orleans, La.
*Memphis State University	Memphis, Tenn.
*Vanderbilt University	Nashville, Tenn.
West Georgia College	Carrolton, Ga.

Back Issues (1965 thru 1970) of **Dimension** are available from the MLA Materials Center, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10011, at $4.00 per copy.

ON DISPLAY AT THE D.C. HEATH BOOTH

Better Spelling: Fourteen Steps to Spelling Improvement
James I. Brown and Thomas E. Pearsall, University of Minnesota
Fourteen rules and suggestions help students spell thousands of words more readily.
1971 Paper 112 pages code 61655

Efficient Reading Revised Form A
James I. Brown, University of Minnesota
Seventy essays with comprehension tests aid students in communicating more effectively, particularly in reading and writing.
1971 Paper 318 pages code 61036

Writing the Research Paper, Revised Edition
Neal Frank Doubleday, Millikin University
Revised in accordance with *The MLA Style Sheet, Second Edition*, this book discusses the practical problems of using and incorporating source material into an interesting, logical, and well-written term paper. 1971 Paper 128 pages code 81224

Foundation Course in Spanish, Second Edition
Laurel H. Turk, DePauw University
Aurelio M. Espinosa, Jr., Stanford University
This comprehensive first-year program of text, tapes, and student workbook develops a mastery of the basic structures of Spanish, conversational fluency, and familiarity with the many phases of Hispanic civilization. Instructor's Guide available. *Mastering Spanish*, a new second-year text by the authors, continues the program.
1970 Cloth 444 pages code 33332

Foreign Language Verb Wheels
Stuart and Lulu L. Cuthbertson
These ingenious devices display the full conjugation of common irregular verbs as the arrow on the dial is turned to each verb.
French Verb Wheel code 26674
German Verb Wheel code 28753
Spanish Verb Wheel code 31427

D.C. Heath and Company

125 Spring Street
Lexington, Massachusetts 02173

swcel programs develop communication skills

for pre-school and first grade

come to booth six

to see one of these - the oral language program - in action

southwestern cooperative educational laboratory albuquerque new mexico

Pimsleur Language Programs
Reduce Language "drop-outs"

french
spanish
german
& modern
greek

Announcing CCD/TAPEWAY self-instructional mini-courses, designed to renew student interest in the study of foreign languages . . .

by Professor Paul Pimsleur Professor of Education and Romance Languages, State University of New York at Albany

The course can be completed in 30-45 hours, depending on aptitude and motivation. The method is Programmed Oral Instruction. The student converses with native speakers under step-by-step guidance by an expert American teacher — all on tape. Provisions are made for extensive practice. High utility vocabulary is introduced in basic sentence types, with emphasis on fluency and re-combination to meet new situations.

These programs can serve as a terminal limited objective mini-course in a multi-purpose language curriculum, as an individualized listening/speaking adjunct to existing curricula, or as an introduction to continued study of the language. These programs, when used with group tutorial sessions, have, in many cases, given students the confidence and incentive to resume a deeper study of foreign languages. You have a choice of reel-to-reel tapes or cassettes. A reading booklet is included. Objective tests will soon be available to measure student progress. Speaking, listening, and reading will be measured separately. Sample kits are available for $12.50. Component descriptions and a price list will be sent on request.

The Center for Curriculum Development, Inc.
401 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. 19106 U.S.A.

In Canada write:
Marcel Didier, Canada, Ltee, 1442 Avenue McGill College, Montreal, 110 P.Q., Canada